

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 9347) authorizing the appointment of Brig. Gen. John H. Patterson, United States Army, retired, as a major general on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 9348) for the relief of J. H. Livingston; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 9349) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to John Zimmerman for certain lands in the Colorado National Forest upon the surrender of other lands of an equal acreage also located in the Colorado National Forest, Colo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 9350) granting an increase of pension to Robert McMartin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9351) granting a pension to Thomas J. Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.,

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution of the Missouri Live-Stock Producers' Association, asking that the rural-credit law be strengthened, and asking the Food Administration to state whether the ratio of 13 to 1 would be maintained in the purchase of spring farrows, or whether the price of corn would be arbitrarily fixed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Lady of the Lake Lodge, No. 512, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Toledo, Ohio, urging increase in salaries particularly to those employed by the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry rural carriers of the ninth congressional district of Missouri, asking maintenance and equipment allowance for extra mileage and additional pay for pouch mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolution of the board of governors of the International Allied Printing Trades Association (approved by the tenth annual convention of the union label trades department of the American Federation of Labor), protesting against the zone system as applied to second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Asbury Park Chamber of Commerce, of Asbury Park, N. J., recommending the abandonment of the zone plan for second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: Petition of 43 employees of the Trask, Prescott & Richardson department store, of Erie, Pa., praying for the passage of House bill 7995, for the preservation of the *Niagara*, Commodore Perry's flagship in the Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of W. S. McCrea, Spokane, Wash., favoring S. 313, providing for an absolute long-and-short-haul law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Colgate & Co., New York, N. Y., urging the passage of the Calder daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Board of Governors of the International Allied Printing Trades Association, of the New York Business Publishers' Association, and of the Asbury Park Chamber of Commerce, Asbury Park, N. J., protesting against the provisions of the revenue act concerning second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a letter from the Pineoleum Co., New York City, favoring the provisions of the revenue act dealing with second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of the Board of Governors of the International Allied Printing Trades Association urging the repeal of the zonal system for second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Memorial of New York Business Publishers' Association, favoring repeal of the zone system for second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the Irish Women's Council, appealing for the recognition of Ireland as the Irish Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY of Alabama: Petitions of Louis Long, R. F. D. No. 1, Irvington, Ala.; Rudolph B. Cox, R. F. D. No. 1, Coffeeville, Ala.; G. L. Shreve, R. F. D. No. 1, Chrichton, Ala.; and G. W. Riley, R. F. D. No. 1, Jeddo, Ala., urging an increase in the salaries of rural free-delivery mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a petition of Earl C. Garrison, H. L. McElroy, Thomas J. Robinson, David E. Wilson, Seaborn L. Bonner, and Wilton

P. Woolf, rural letter carriers of Choctaw County, Ala., urging an increase of salaries, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 8585, granting a pension to Eugene V. Wagner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: Petition of 46 rural carriers, urging the passage of a bill providing a maintenance and equipment allowance, additional pay for mileage in excess of 24 miles, and an allowance for those carriers who must carry pouch mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolution of knitting manufacturers of Philadelphia, of the National Association of Hosiery and Underwear Manufacturers, protesting against the action of the Fuel Administrator in closing industrial plants; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PLATT: Petition of citizens of Newburgh, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 7995 for the preservation of the *Niagara*, Commodore Perry's flagship in the Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PRATT: Petitions of sundry rural mail carriers of the Thirty-seventh New York congressional district, favoring adequate compensation for their services; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of rural-route carriers of the twentieth district of Illinois for a larger allowance; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. REED: Evidence in support of House bill 9303, granting an increase of pension to Joseph Crites; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANFORD: Papers to accompany House bill 9143, granting a pension to Henrietta De Groat; also, papers to accompany House bill 9139, granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Trimble; and also, papers to accompany House bill 9141, granting a pension to Rosella Magee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 9145, for the relief of John J. Dooley; also, papers to accompany House bill 9148, for the relief of Martin W. Joraleman, alias Whitbeck; also, papers to accompany House bill 9147, for the relief of Henry C. Romaine; also, papers to accompany House bill 9146, for the relief of Ferris W. Wade; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 29, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hearest the prayers of those who seek Thee in faith and confidence, hasten the day, we beseech Thee, when pure and undefiled religion shall be spread abroad in all the earth; when men of all nations and of all climes shall look up to Thee in faith and call Thee Father; that by the strong ties of brotherhood men shall, indeed, fulfill the prophecy of old and beat their swords into plowshares, their spears into pruning hooks, and learn war no more.

So may Thy Kingdom come and Thy will be done in all the world, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MAIL TO EXPEDITIONARY FORCES.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker. I call up a privileged resolution, H. Res. 232, and move to discharge the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads from further consideration of the same and that the same be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 232.

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be requested to inform this House upon the following:

First. What is the length of time now required to transmit postal matter from the United States to members of the American Expeditionary Force in France, and from members of the American Expeditionary Force in France to the destination of such postal matter within the United States.

Second. Whether he or any other person or persons or committee or committees or commission or commissions appointed by him have investigated or are now investigating the subject in order to ascertain whether the time now consumed in transit can be curtailed, and losses, if any, of mail matter be reduced.

Third. Whether he or such other person or persons or committee or committees or commission or commissions have reported.

Fourth. What were the findings and recommendations, if any, contained in such report.

Fifth. And what, if any, steps he has taken to curtail the time of such postal matter in transit and reduce the losses thereof, if any.

Mr. KITCHIN. When was the resolution referred?

Mr. ROGERS. On the 22d of this month.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to discharge the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads from further consideration of the resolution and agree to the same.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3448. An act granting the consent of Congress to the village of East Dundee and the village of West Dundee to construct a bridge across the Fox River; and

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to provide for the restoration and completion of the historical frieze in the Rotunda of the Capitol.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 3135. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for an auxiliary reclamation project in connection with the Yuma project, Ariz."

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9054, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose last evening an amendment was pending, offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 24, strike out the figures "\$242,320" and insert the figures "\$363,480."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto may close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire whether we are going to have the customary motion to strike out the seed item, which is the provision under consideration?

Mr. LEVER. I am not advised as to that, but I presume we will have it, however.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] said that he wanted to do that.

Mr. LEVER. He gave some indications of that, but he did not quite say so.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the proceedings of Congress would be hardly complete without some person moving to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Or moving to increase the amount.

Mr. STAFFORD. Both motions are always in order, and always take place.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. There is an amendment pending, and that comes first.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no question that the gentleman's amendment takes precedence.

Mr. LEVER. I feel that this is a matter so well understood by the members of the committee that we ought not to spend any great time in discussing it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can there be some understanding as to the control of the 30 minutes, that some of the time, if desired, may be used in consideration of a motion to strike out the paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request by adding that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER], who is proposing to increase the amount, and myself in the interest of those who may desire to strike it out.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the gentleman will allow at least 15 minutes of that time for those in opposition to the provision itself?

Mr. LEVER. I shall allow half the time to those who are opposed to the Candler amendment and half the time to those who are in favor of striking the provision out altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Mississippi

[Mr. CANDLER] and the remaining 15 minutes by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have 10 minutes on a motion to strike out the provision relating to the congressional distribution of seeds.

Mr. LEVER. I would not be able to promise the gentleman 10 minutes of the 15 minutes that I would have myself.

Mr. LONDON. I want to argue in favor of a motion to strike out in an original way, and I want to have 10 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman always argues in an original way.

Mr. LONDON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. I shall try to give the gentleman at least five minutes of my 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, is it not possible to get along with 10 minutes debate on this paragraph, one in favor and one against it?

Mr. LEVER. If I had my own way, I would say 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Would it not be better for the House of Representatives to have a little more discussion about bullets and a little less about bird seed?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington object to the request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have no inclination to detain the House in reference to this matter but a very few moments. The fact is all I desire to do is to call the attention of the House to the effect of the amendment which I have offered and which is now pending. The provision of the bill is the same provision which appeared in the bill last year, and I believe the bill of the year before last and several preceding years. The motion which I propose only changes the amount and does not change a single word in the provision itself. The amount provided in the bill at the present time is \$242,320. My motion is to strike out \$242,320 and insert in lieu thereof \$363,480, which is a 50 per cent increase over the amount provided for in the bill. I do this for the reason that a great many Members of Congress this year have come to my office and told me they did not have a sufficient quantity of seed to meet the demands which were yearly made upon them, and hence they desired that the amount should be increased. Under the appropriation this year each Member of Congress is allotted 20,000 packages of garden and 3,000 packages of flower seed. If this amendment is adopted and the price remains the same as it is now, next year you will be allotted 30,000 packages of garden seed and 4,500 packages of flower seed, and the only question, therefore, for the committee to determine is whether or not you want this increase made, whether you want this increased amount of money in order that there may be available an increased number of packages of flower and garden seed. If you do, you will vote for the amendment; if you do not, you will vote against the amendment. That is the sole issue involved. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who, I understand, is in favor of striking out the whole item.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers a motion to strike out. Of course that will not be disposed of until the motion to perfect has been disposed of.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the argument of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] in the nature of a very alluring bait held out by him in offering an amendment to increase this amount to approximately \$360,000 and the fact that next year we will get 30,000 packages of vegetable seed and 4,500 packages of flower seed, it seems to me that at this time, when we are straining every effort to raise money to carry on this tremendous struggle, that we ought not to appropriate even the \$243,000 carried in the bill as reported by the committee—nearly a quarter of a million dollars—for the purpose of making these governmental gifts to our constituents. I was interested the other day in receiving a little pamphlet which has been issued by the National Grange, and I noted that amongst the recommendations made by that great organization, speaking for the real farmers of the Nation, was one for the elimination of this congressional seed distribution. Those with whom I had the honor to serve in the Sixty-fourth Congress know my views upon this matter, because at that time I set them forth somewhat at length in opposition to this form

of expenditure and to this method of distributing this form of Federal gratuities. The purpose is, I presume, to encourage and stimulate agriculture, and we give little packages of seed which are sent out throughout the length and breadth of the district and which contains upon the package, printed there by the department, a request that the people planting those seeds will write to the department the results that they obtain, and yet you can read the reports of the Secretary of Agriculture year after year and all you will ascertain is that a certain amount of money has been expended for these seeds and they have been distributed through requests from Members of Congress. Now, while the appropriation is made—and presumably it is the intention for these seeds to be sent to the different congressional districts to the people who are interested—if the number of requests that are received for seeds can be taken as any standard as to the interest in this congressional seed distribution, the interest, particularly in my section of the country, is not very great, and I doubt if it is warranted even if the requests filed are very numerous. If the people are going to utilize these seeds and if they are going to attempt to stimulate agriculture, why should not some report be made as to how many new farmers each year were made as the result of this activity or how much the crop of a particular vegetable or flower has been increased or how much any particular community has been benefited by this distribution. I say, Mr. Chairman, that at this time we might well afford to save \$243,000, or, if the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi is adopted, the larger sum, \$360,000 plus, and transfer it to the funds which will have to be expended by the military branch of this Government in giving our soldiers proper food, clothing, or shoes, or equipment and not put a burden upon the people of nearly a quarter of a million dollars additional for any such purpose as this, and I think this is a good time for the House to indicate a spirit of economy and for them to be willing to put aside any personal desires to be known as distributors of seed and say to the country that they are willing to forego this congressional seed distribution during this great war. I believe it will meet with general commendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment increasing by 50 per cent the amount for garden seed offered by my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER]. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] does not want the people of this country to have enough to eat. He proposes to take this little dab that the farmers have in the way of garden and flower seed and put it into cannon. The gentleman from Massachusetts well knows that you could get but one cannon for this total amount of \$243,000. We are now giving to every household in the United States these packages of seeds, and the people plant them in their little back yards and gardens in every town, village, city, and farm of this Republic, and it does more good than any other money that this Congress ever appropriates. The gentleman from Massachusetts says that he never gets any requests for seeds to amount to anything. Perhaps his people live where they do not work, or perhaps his people are living off of somebody else or out of the public crib. [Laughter and applause.]

Every man, I care not what may be his station in life, should be encouraged, especially at this time, to have a little garden. For the money involved, for the exercise it gives a man of sedentary habits—the lawyer, the doctor, the banker, the merchant—every man, not only farmers, really should be encouraged to enjoy raising a garden, to be certain that every home in our land will have plenty of fine fresh vegetables on the dining table. At this time, when food is scarce, every individual of this Republic is encouraged by the Food Administrator to have gardens. Why, last year you saw the propaganda everywhere urging every city of this Republic to plant vegetables on every vacant lot.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman states that these seeds went to every household in our Nation. I would like to ask the gentleman how many lawyers, doctors, bankers, and merchants in his district receive seeds from his office but who have no garden, and who throw them in the wastebasket every year?

Mr. QUIN. I want to say that I have not any type of lawyers and bankers and merchants of that kind. Every lawyer and every banker and merchant in my district, if his name is on the registry list, gets a package of seed from his Congressman. That lawyer or banker or merchant plants those seeds, just like the farmers and laboring people of the towns, and as a rule they have good gardens.

Right down here on the Potomac River we had the Boy Scouts growing corn last year, the finest corn I have ever seen in the North or in the East, 10 feet high, growing ears of corn that almost broke the stalks down, and yet the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] objects to people having garden seeds with which to plant gardens and raise vegetables.

Why, the garden seeds that I send out, so the people write me, grow tomatoes as big around as horse apples. The finest vegetables seeds that have been sent out in years were those the department furnished us to send out last year, and now the gentleman from Massachusetts seems to think that we should not only not increase the amount by adopting the amendment that the gentleman from Mississippi offers, but should be barred altogether from having a single seed to give the people of this Republic.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. QUIN. Could the gentleman from Mississippi give me two minutes more?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I yield two minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIN. I thank the gentleman.

All over the United States the cry is going up, "Plant your fence corners in foodstuffs." I take it that every patriotic Congressman in this House feels like encouraging the people to do that thing. Every farm demonstrator is a patriot, and is urging the people on the platform and in his daily contact with them to plant all the food crops possible. And yet the gentleman from Massachusetts wants to take away from the farmers the seed that the Government is sending out.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Are all the farmers in the gentleman's district voters?

Mr. QUIN. Oh, yes; if they want to be.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I can not, my time is limited.

I have not this foreign element that comes over here, a strain of anarchists and loud-mouthed fellows. The people in my district and their ancestors are all full-fledged Americans. The farmers are not aliens or foreigners waiting to be naturalized. They are native-born citizens. Of course, the people in my country are loyal, patriotic American citizens and appreciate what the Government is doing for them.

And I wish to say further, my friends, that the patriotic farmer away back from the railroad, with his house on a hillside, when receiving a package of garden seed from his Government, from his Congressman, realizes that the Government thinks something of him. That man loves his country and is at all times ready to fight for our Nation's flag. The gentleman from Massachusetts proposes to take that man's son, grab him by the nap of the neck and throw him into the Government service by force, and yet he objects to that man receiving a package of free garden seed to plant. [Applause.] I want to encourage the good feeling between the people and the Government, and the more we can encourage the people of this country to plant food crops by distributing free seeds to them the better it is for the Government. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. QUIN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to admonish the galleries that it is contrary to the rules of the House for the occupants of the galleries to express either approval or disapproval of remarks made on the floor.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the distribution of seeds. The Agricultural Department is one of the most valuable departments in the Government. The farmer, the tiller of the soil, is the most valuable element of the citizenship of the country, and the Government should be ready to aid him. What I do oppose, however, is the distribution of seed by Members of Congress. I can not for the life of me understand why a Member of Congress should be called upon to do the work of the Department of Agriculture. Members of Congress permit themselves entirely too much to be employed in clerical capacities for their districts. In the past the work of Congress was limited to appropriation bills and to the discussion of two or three fundamental issues relating to the tariff or to reform of the currency. That almost exhausted the legislative work of the House and of the Senate. Recently the scope of national legislation has been widening. Measures calculated to prevent the farmer from sinking into the condition of the farmless tenant have been engrossing the attention of Congress. The farmless

farmer will soon be heard from. Industrial labor will have something to say to us.

With concentration of industry and agriculture, State legislation has been giving way to national legislation.

New problems are pressing upon us. They will become more and more acute. We are in the midst of the greatest crisis of the world. The world is being remade. Instead of applying ourselves to a study of the new forces that have been awakened in the world, we are busy sending franks to the Department of Agriculture for the distribution of seed. It is degrading in another sense. It makes the average man believe that his Member of Congress is doing something for him. The name of the Member appears on the package, and the average man is made to believe that he is the recipient of a special benefit, of a special blessing, coming from the Member of Congress. He is distributing seed. He is distributing favors. He is doing something for which he deserves the special gratitude of his constituents.

I would like to see that provision stricken out. I am with the farmer and for the farmer. He is the most useful man in the world, the most valuable man. I wish the world could have retained that rugged integrity, that honesty, that simplicity of soul that is so characteristic of the man who tills the soil. The world would have been better off. [Applause.]

I am trying to point out to you the necessity of using every moment of our time, of applying ourselves completely, uninterruptedly, to the study of the great problems that are facing the country and facing the world to-day. We can not properly do that if we encourage our constituent to believe that all that he has to expect from us is the distribution of seeds, the distribution of documents, and a lot of other clerical work. We should not be asked to chaperon the individual constituents in the various departments.

I would like to see the provision which relates to the congressional distribution of seeds stricken out. I would vote for any adequate appropriation of money to distribute anything of value to the farmer through the Agricultural Department. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for one minute.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to devote one minute to asking a question of my friend from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER]. I would like to ask him if he is willing to incorporate in his amendment a provision that would take the name of every Congressman off the packages of garden seeds and let them be distributed by the Department of Agriculture, where they belong, not to the lawyers, doctors, bankers, and merchants in cities who have no gardens and who do not want them, but to all people alike who have gardens and who do want them, eliminating all political preference to political friends entirely. Is the gentleman willing to incorporate that in his amendment?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I have had similar questions asked of me a number of times in previous sessions of Congress. I do not care anything about my name being on the package, or the name of any other Member of Congress, and I do not favor distributing them for political preferences. I have always said I prefer to have the seeds distributed by the Members rather than directly by the Department of Agriculture. I favor distributing them to all the people alike. I have always insisted that the seeds should be distributed by Members of Congress to their constituents, because the Members are more familiar with the wants of their constituents than the department could possibly be, and therefore the Members can render their constituents better service, and I feel sure they distribute the seed equitably, and what I want is to give the people the best benefits possible, and I believe it can best be done by that method, and therefore I would not accept such an amendment as the gentleman from Texas suggests.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I am against the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Would you have favored it otherwise?

Mr. BLANTON. I would be in favor of increasing it \$100,000 if the gentleman would adopt my suggestion. I shall give my views on this legislation more in detail later on during this debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKINLEY] three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, last summer, while the industrious House of Representatives had completed all of the bills pending before it and was waiting on the Senate, I used up about a week visiting around Boston, Mass., and vicinity. I found around there rocks and swamps, ammunition factories and shipyards. I can very well appreciate how a Representative from that locality would feel it would be much better for the House to use the \$27,000,000 appropriated for the Department of Agriculture and put it into one battleship, because we could kill somebody with that battleship.

Now, out our way we are trying to follow out the recommendations of Mr. Hoover, to teach the people to save and to raise food. Out there in my district there are some 20,000 children between 8 and 12 years old. Mr. Hoover and the Department of Agriculture want those children to be encouraged to cultivate more gardens. Therefore I am sending out the 20,000 packages of seed that will be allotted to me to the children. I am sending with them a pamphlet from the Department of Agriculture, specially prepared, to encourage children to cultivate gardens. I hope and I know that by next year in our district, where we are rapidly increasing in population, there will be 30,000 children who will want these packages to supply 30,000 gardens. Therefore I support the amendment to increase this distribution from 20,000 to 30,000 packages. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I come from one of the finest agricultural districts in the United States. It is not made up of swamps and rocks and munition factories. The Government has been distributing these garden seeds over that district for the last 25 years, perhaps; and I wish to say this, that out from that great agricultural district I have received less than 50 applications from farmers for these seeds. I have received less than 500 applications from men who work in the factories for these seeds.

Before I left home I talked to the agricultural agent in my county, and asked him if he would not take off my hands the matter of distributing these seeds. He said, "No; I do not want to have anything to do with them. They are a fraud and a humbug, and I do not want to get into trouble with the farmers of this county by having to distribute those seeds among them."

I am not opposed to the Government furnishing free seeds to the poor people in any part of this country if it is necessary in order to enable them to have gardens, but I am opposed to this political propaganda of scattering bunches of seed all over this country under congressional frank for whatever political benefit may come from it to the man who sends them. I am therefore in favor of voting to strike out that part of this bill which appropriates for seeds nearly a quarter of a million dollars of the people's money that can be better used for some other purpose in this war. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall heartily support the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] to increase this appropriation for the purpose of extending the work of the distribution of field seeds for the benefit of the agricultural interests of our country.

I have taken a good deal of pains and trouble to ascertain whether or not this appropriation in the past has been worth while, and whether or not it really brings to the country as a whole beneficial results; and my experience in my own district is that the people have been benefited, and that they would be greatly disappointed and feel themselves injured if this small allowance of field seeds were withheld from them.

Now the argument seems to be advanced by some Members on the floor of this House that it is all right to distribute the seeds, but that the method is all wrong, and that we are resorting to political methods and using this as a means of political advertisement. Mr. Chairman, I am not disposed to quibble or debate as to the method. If some more satisfactory and beneficial method can be devised I am entirely willing to support that; but in the absence of some more feasible and successful method I think we had better adhere to the present plan. I have sent seeds to every citizen in my district, and in so doing I find that every year I overdraw my allowance of field seeds and must hustle around and see if I can find enough to supply all.

I do not make it a political matter at all. I get a list of all voters, Democrats and Republicans alike, and of widows and of those who have not reached their majority, and I endeavor to distribute these seeds like the rain from heaven to Democrats and Republicans, the just as well as unjust, if there be any of the latter. [Laughter.] My friends all pay taxes similarly and should all receive the same benefits from the Government. At this time when the price of living is so high and foodstuffs are so scarce, and there is a tremendous propaganda conducted by the Agricultural Department and by the other departments of our Government to encourage our people to increase the production of foodstuffs, I think it is rather too small a policy for us to deny to the farmers this infinitesimal appropriation or try to cut it off or to fail to increase it, so that the farmer may be benefited and the opportunity be given to increase the supply of foodstuffs and reduce the cost of living.

There was a time, perhaps, when the Department of Agriculture paid little attention to the selection of vegetable and other seeds to be distributed among the people of the country. But that time has passed. I have discussed with the authorities at the Agricultural Department, and they inform me that great care and pains are exercised in the selection of these seeds, and that none but the best are distributed. Frequent letters received from my constituents bear me out in this statement that these seeds are not only appreciated in most instances but are expected and result in a lot of benefit to the people as a whole. Of course, there are some that do not care to have them and feel that it is money thrown away. But I doubt if the Government makes a single appropriation of similar amount which results in greater benefits, that is more evenly distributed to all the people than this small appropriation.

During the Sixty-second, Sixty-third, and Sixty-fourth Congresses more legislation was enacted for the benefit of agriculture than had previously been done perhaps in 50 years. The legislation making Federal aid to the construction of public roads, the farm-loan act, the Federal reserve law, and many more too numerous to mention have given the farmer recognition and opportunity that he had never been accorded before. Are we now during this Congress, when the world demand for production of foodstuffs is the greatest ever known since the beginning of time, to do anything that would manifest a lack of appreciation to the agricultural class? Instead of denying or curtailing this appropriation we should increase it, as this amendment proposes to do, and by this means contribute at least in a small way to increase the production of food for the benefit of ourselves and our allies to reduction in some measure of the high cost of living and to the contentment and welfare of humanity. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] has two minutes and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] two minutes. If they do not desire to use it, the Chair will put the question.

Mr. LEVER. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to vote for the appropriation carried in the bill, although at some times and under different conditions than those now existing I have been in favor of striking it out. I think, however, the amount is enough and that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi to increase the appropriation largely ought not to be adopted.

Mr. LEVER. I ask the gentleman from Mississippi to consume his time. I have only one speech.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I shall take my remaining two minutes merely to emphasize and call attention to what is involved, because quite a number of members have come in since the discussion began and some have come to me and asked what is involved. The sole question involved in this amendment is whether or not you will increase the appropriation for this purpose 50 per cent. If you do so, then, of course, the quantity of seed which will be distributed next year will be increased 50 per cent over what it is this year. If you were allotted 20,000 packages this year, if the price remains the same, next year there will be 30,000 packages allotted to you for distribution. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] says turn this money over to the military department of the Government. I am willing to vote for every dollar the military department needs, but the military department do not need money. They have plenty of money. There is no difficulty about that. They have money for every purpose that they can usefully apply it to. Now, to this immediate question under consideration. Take the one item of the velvet bean. Nobody knew anything about that. It was discovered and put into circulation and distribution through Members of Congress by the Department of Agriculture, and

it has proven to be a great source of food supply throughout the country, and by reason of its use in feeding it the people are enabled to increase their meat supply to a marvelous extent. That is simply an illustration. Here is another. Listen to this letter:

Hon. E. S. CANDLER,
Washington, D. C.:

MY DEAR MR. CANDLER: Last winter while I was in Washington you told me of the success of a friend of yours with a new variety of sorghum, the seed of which you sent from the Department of Agriculture. At my request you had a small bag of these seed sent to me. Enough to plant, with care, about 1 acre. I divided them among several friends—planting about one-fifth acre myself. The result was most gratifying. In spite of an excessive local drouth the result on all plots was extremely satisfactory. The yield was 120 to 260 gallons per acre—fully double the local average of other sorghums. Quality of sirup the very finest. General report is that as a food it is splendidly digestible—much more so than is the sirup of ribbon cane. I find the flavor most attractive. Like it as well as I do the good sirup of ribbon cane.

The cane headed out well, but the extreme drouth prevented maturing of seed. For this reason we have none. So I am asking you to have sent to me a full-size package of the seed, Honey Sargo. If permissible—as I wish to divide with neighbors—would like to have two packages. Be sure it is Honey Sargo.

There is a general clamor for Government seed. Our people are learning that these Government garden seed are the very best.

[Applause.]

I might use many others to show how the production of food in this country has been increased in this way. And while the President of the United States, the Food Administrator, and everybody down along the line are calling upon the people throughout this country to be patriotic and increase the production of food, to use every bit of ground that is possible, to utilize the back yards and front yards, the vacant lots, and every available space in order to increase food production, it is a poor policy to turn around and say to the people you will not allow the seeds to plant the available ground to bring about the increased production so necessary. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. I yield a minute of my time to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, there are two items in this bill in respect to the distribution of seeds. One is for rare and valuable field seeds. The other is for the ordinary congressional distribution of garden and flower seeds. I am in favor of the distribution of the rare and new varieties of field seeds. Those are needed by the farmers and are very valuable. The ordinary garden seeds and flower seeds which we distribute are of such a quality as the ordinary farmer can buy at any country store. We are not sending to the farmers something that they can not buy or can not get conveniently. I find in my district a very great demand, a real demand for new varieties of field seeds. The farmers in my district are anxious to try out and introduce into their localities new kinds of crops, better crops, better varieties of seeds. There is a real demand for them, and I think all of this money ought to be used for the new varieties of field seeds. It would not be too much money to spend in that way. I regard the money spent for flower seeds and garden seeds as largely wasted, and I believe that is the view of most of those who live in my congressional district. That is true to such an extent that I sometimes hesitate to send out the seeds. I have made the distributions in the past upon the theory that after having been voted by Congress the people of my district have a right to their share even if they are of little value. But, gentlemen, do you not think this practice ought to be stopped? It can not be defended. It is not necessary. It does not improve agriculture in any way, and I do not believe it reflects any credit upon Congress.

Mr. Chairman, if those here to-day, evidently in the majority, desire to distribute seed, why not let it be a quality of field seeds such as the farmers can not buy in the ordinary markets or some rare or new variety of seeds. A good example is Durum wheat, which the Government introduced into this country and distributed among farmers to be tried out. It has been a wonderful success. Some years it has sold for better prices than the old varieties, and it has resisted plant diseases better than most of the other varieties of wheat. That is the kind of intelligent selection and distribution of seeds which is helpful to the grain raisers, and if followed to the exclusion of the cheap, ordinary varieties of garden seeds will reflect credit upon Congress. I appeal to you, gentlemen, to eliminate this wasteful appropriation. I hope the motion to strike out will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] moves to perfect the text by increasing the amount of the appropriation, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] moves to strike out the paragraph. The amendment to perfect the text must first be voted on.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 65, noes 37.

Accordingly the amendment of Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to strike out the paragraph.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. WALSH) there were—ayes 26, noes 75.

Accordingly the motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Forest Service: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to experiment and to make and continue investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building erected shall not exceed \$650; to pay all expenses necessary to protect, administer, and improve the national forests; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests; and the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, permit timber and other forest products cut or removed from the national forests to be exported from the State or Territory in which said forests are respectively situated; to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to employ agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in practical forestry and in the administration of national forests in the city of Washington and elsewhere; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service; to purchase necessary supplies, apparatus, and office fixtures, and technical books and technical journals for officers of the Forest Service stationed outside of Washington, and for medical supplies and services and other assistance necessary for immediate relief for artisans, laborers, and other employees engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service; to pay freight, express, telephone, and telegraph charges; for electric light and power, fuel, gas, ice, washing towels, and official traveling and other necessary expenses, including traveling expenses for legal and fiscal officers while performing Forest Service work; and for rent outside of the District of Columbia, as follows:

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 33, line 25, after the word "relief," strike out the word "for" and insert in lieu thereof the word "of."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I notice that in this paragraph there is provision for the transportation and care of fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein. I desire to ask where that fish is procured, whether from the National Bureau of Fisheries or from other sources, and if from the Federal commission or bureau, why it is necessary to provide for the care of its transportation.

Mr. LEVER. Without having the specific information at hand, I should say that it refers to the fish and game of the national forests.

Mr. WALSH. That is separate and distinct from the Bureau of Fisheries?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I want to call the attention of the chairman of this committee to the situation in the law that interferes with the procuring of timber by the military arm of the United States, which it needs badly for aeroplane stock from the forest reserves. I want to say that after some effort on my part to straighten out the confusion the Secretary of Agriculture and the Bureau of Forestry have looked into the matter, and at my request there has been prepared an amendment to amend the law passed in the Fifty-sixth Congress by which timber can not be sold until advertisements for bids are made 30 days ahead of the sale. It is proposed to let sales for war uses be made without advertising. I shall have a copy of the amendment in a few moments. I am not certain to which section it ought to be offered. I rise to ask that we proceed with the bill with the privilege of returning to any section dealing with the Forest Service to which the amendment may be germane for the purpose of offering that amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with the matter mentioned by the gentleman from Washington, and I have no objection to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed with the reading of the bill, with the privilege of returning to the forest-reserve sections to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to return to any section pertaining to the

Forest Service in the bill for the purpose of offering amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Olympic National Forest, Wash., \$16,598.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask how this appropriation for the Olympic National Forest, Wash., \$16,598, compares with the appropriation of the preceding year. Has it come down any?

Mr. LEVER. It is exactly the same.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Are most of these forest-reserve appropriations in the bill about the same as they were last year?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; about the same.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Any new forest reserves been created?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Umpqua National Forest, Oreg., \$10,109.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman a question. Can the chairman give any definite information as to the ability of these forest reserves to be self-supporting?

Mr. LEVER. I should be glad to furnish the information to the gentleman and the House. The past fiscal year the receipts from the national forests amounted in the total to \$3,457,000, an increase of \$633,000 over the present fiscal year. This increase was \$265,000 from timber sales, \$339,000 from the grazing receipts, and \$29,000 from other miscellaneous sources, like the sale of wood and things of that kind. The total cost of administering, normally, the forest reserves is about \$4,000,000, so that the receipts and the cost of administration are coming pretty close together; \$3,450,000 in the way of receipts as against \$4,000,000 in the way of expenditure.

Mr. FESS. If we go back for a period of years has the cost of administration increased with the years?

Mr. LEVER. If we go back a long period that is true, but for the last three or four years the cost of administering the forest reserves is about the same, a little decrease in this bill.

Mr. FESS. But the revenue has increased?

Mr. LEVER. Slowly and steadily increased.

Mr. FESS. Then we may infer that ultimately the forest reserves will be a source of income to the Government?

Mr. LEVER. I see no reason why it should not become a source of income to the Government.

Mr. FESS. I asked the question purely as a matter of information. I wanted to know whether or not there is a possibility in the near future of this particular agency becoming productive financially.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think there is any question but that the forests can be made self-sustaining under normal conditions.

Mr. FESS. I might say to the chairman that on a trip West I visited the national park at Tacoma, the Rainier Reservation, and it was a great eye opener, having lived in the country and knowing something about wood and timber. I could not imagine the possibilities of the forest and timber in such a place as that. It is incredible to one who had never seen anything of that sort. I was wondering whether such possibilities were outside of a few of these national parks.

Mr. LEVER. There is an immense amount of timber in the national forests, and I am satisfied that the Forestry Service could be made self-sustaining in a very short time if the cutting of the timber should be speeded up.

Mr. FESS. Is any of this appropriation expended in road building?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; we carry an item of \$400,000 further on in the bill for the improvement of the national forests, and out of that we build some roads.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman spoke about the normal expenses being about so much. Did the gentleman mean that the expense had been increased in the last year or two?

Mr. LEVER. No; I do not think the Forest Service expenses have been increased, except, probably, very little in the last five or six years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. FESS, saw the big timber on the Rainier Forest Reserve, but he must realize that if the Government should start in on a policy of cutting and selling that timber in great quantities, in order to make the Forest Service pay, it would ruin the

timber business in the State in which the reserve is located. In other words, when you put private timber owners into competition with the great timber on these reserves both sides are going to suffer.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Washington that I think the policy pursued by the Government heretofore in timber cutting has been safe and sane.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We in the West agree to that; the Government has pursued a policy of not ruining the industry, and at the same time has made the Government prices act as a regulator of the market. Of course, for a number of years, until 20 months or so ago, the bottom was out of timber, and all prices were at the lowest possible level. But whether timber is high or low, people in the Middle West—people in Nebraska, for instance—never can understand why rough lumber costs them \$40 to \$45 a thousand feet—never less and frequently more. They believe somebody is making an enormous profit at the tree; but when the people in Nebraska are paying \$40 to \$45 a thousand feet for rough lumber, the man who has bought the tree from the man who felled it, has sawed it up at the mill, gets only \$7 or \$8 or \$9 a thousand feet, so he is not making any great profit.

Mr. FESS. Does the country suffer any great loss from forest fires, or has it in the last few years?

Mr. LEVER. In 1910 we had a terrifically destructive forest fire, which destroyed property valued, if my recollection serves me right, at about \$25,000,000. This past year we had another rather destructive forest fire, but on account of the increased efficiency of the Forest Service, while they had a larger number of outbreaks than they had in 1910, probably 500, they held the losses down to very much less than they were in 1910. They created a deficit this year of \$775,000 for fighting fires that occurred. We carry an appropriation of only \$150,000 for that purpose. It was necessary for them to create a deficit, and they have that matter now before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FESS. Are we supporting any school as a Government school for the training of forest rangers to fight fires?

Mr. LEVER. No.

Mr. FESS. I think some States are. Pennsylvania, I believe, has a school devoted entirely to that work.

Mr. LEVER. A patriotic Frenchman was conducting some years ago a forest school at Asheville, N. C., but I am not sure whether he is continuing to do that now or not.

Mr. FESS. The danger from forest fires is imminent. I should judge, and is the Government taking any additional steps which we have not heretofore taken?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; we are providing in this bill a little different system of employing fire fighters. Heretofore we have employed only two classes of forest rangers, one a year-long forest ranger and the other a six-months-long forest ranger. We are proposing to reduce the number of year-long forest rangers and increase the number of six-months forest rangers, and, in addition to that, provide for a three-months forest ranger, so that we can have the longest body of men at the critical seasons of the year, when fires are most likely to occur.

Mr. FESS. What about this range along the Adirondacks? Are we continuing operations there?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes; last year, the gentleman will remember, we carried in this bill, and it became a law, \$3,000,000 in addition to the original amount carried in the Weeks Act of \$10,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of methods for timber distillation and for the preservative treatment of timber, for wood testing, and the testing of such woods as may require test to ascertain if they be suitable for making paper, for investigations and tests within the United States of foreign woods of commercial importance to industries in the United States, and for other investigations and experiments to promote economy in the use of forest products, and for commercial demonstrations of improved methods or processes, in cooperation with individuals and companies, \$173,260.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question as to how extensive these tests and investigations have been with reference to finding suitable material for making paper from these wood or timber products.

Mr. LEVER. The work at the Madison laboratory at this time is being concentrated very largely on the proposition of testing timber for the uses in the Army. For example, they are testing spruce now for use in the building of aeroplanes, and they are testing other woods for wagons and other purposes that the Army needs. The work is being concentrated along that line. Heretofore, however, extensive experiments and

investigations have been made at this laboratory with a view of finding whether we have any timber available out of which we could get print paper, and while we have no definite report this year about it, except in the report of the Forest Service, I think it is safe to say that they have made some headway and have developed some rather interesting results.

Mr. WALSH. Where did the gentleman say this laboratory is located?

Mr. LEVER. At Madison, Wis.

Mr. WALSH. How long have these investigations been going on?

Mr. LEVER. This work has been going on, I should say, 12 years at least—a good long while.

Mr. WALSH. And during all of that time they have not yet discovered whether some timber products are available for paper?

Mr. LEVER. I think they have, as a matter of fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, the school has done a great service in testing the strength of woods and developing by-products of wood, and in the making of wood flour for use in linoleum, and a thousand different things.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes.

Mr. WALSH. My inquiry went to the making of paper. I wanted to ascertain what has been accomplished during this period in ascertaining the suitability of timber products for the making of paper.

Mr. LEVER. I think I can say that the results have been both positive and negative. In other words, they have developed that a great many woods that we thought were valuable for the making of print paper and other kinds of paper were not so, and they have had some positive results also which they have given to the trade, of course.

Mr. FESS. What proportion—or can the gentleman give the figures—of the wood that we use for wood-pulp purposes is imported into the country?

Mr. LEVER. I could not give the exact figures, but I know it is a very large proportion.

Mr. FESS. In proportion, is it larger than that which we use at home?

Mr. LEVER. That would be my recollection; but it is only a recollection that I am giving the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

For silvicultural, dendrological, and other experiments and investigations independently or in cooperation with other branches of the Federal Government, with States and with individuals, to determine the best methods for the conservative management of forests and forest lands, \$78,728;

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I may be pardoned for asking this question of the chairman of the committee, coming from a region of rocks and swamps. Will the gentleman tell me what these silvicultural and dendrological experiments are? Of what do they consist?

Mr. LEVER. The silvicultural work has to do with the study of the tree itself as it stands in the forest. The dendrological study is a study, as I understand the word, of the life and history of the tree.

Mr. WALSH. And how is that distinguished from arboriculture?

Mr. LEVER. Arboriculture is the study of the cultivation of trees and shrubs.

Mr. WALSH. But it has to do with a tree, grown either in the forest or as an individual specimen?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for general expenses, \$3,247,935.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I referred to a few moments ago I have, and I believe this is the best place to insert the same. After line 11, insert a new paragraph to read as follows.

Mr. LEVER. What page?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Page 45.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 45, after line 11, insert as a new paragraph the following: "And hereafter during the existing state of war the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell without advertisement to any individual, firm, association, or corporation at a fair value to be determined by him, national forest timber which he shall find is to be used for war purposes, and he is also authorized, under regulations to be prescribed by him, to permit the War Department to take from the national forests such timber as may be needed in the prosecution of the war. The Secretary of War, under regulations to be prescribed by him, is hereby authorized to sell, or otherwise dispose of, any of the material manufactured from such timber that is not suitable for war purposes. Any moneys received on account of such material shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is twofold in its purposes. First, it permits the sale of spruce timber at a price without the customary 30-day advertisement for bidders.

There is urgent need of legislation which will authorize the sale of national forest timber, to be used for war purposes, at its appraised value, but without advertisement. The War Department is urging the production of spruce aeroplane stock in every possible way. Some contractors wish to cut timber on the national forests and are ready to pay the appraised stumpage values but hesitate to cut or to get ready to cut during the 30-day period of advertising, since others may submit higher bids for the timber. The result is that very valuable time is lost and the production of spruce is hampered.

The effect of such legislation would not be to reduce the receipts from the sale of timber appreciably. The War Department has fixed the price for spruce logs. In all forest-reserve timber sales competition actually develops in only a very small proportion of the sales, in spite of wide advertisement. Forest Service appraisals are very detailed and usually fix prices as high as the ordinary prudent business man can afford to pay.

Mr. Chairman, the other phase of the amendment permits the War Department to go into the forest reserves and get the timber that it needs.

The need for legislation authorizing the granting of timber free to the War Department during the period of the war also arises chiefly in connection with the production of spruce for aeroplane construction. The War Department lets some contracts for spruce aeroplane material on a cost plus percentage basis. If the contractor has to buy stumpage, it appears as a cost in his accounts and he receives a profit on it. Similar provisions of law already exist authorizing free use of timber on the national forests for the Navy Department, the Alaskan Engineering Commission, and the Reclamation Service.

If the authority is granted, the Government will make a direct saving in the case of contracts let on a cost plus percentage basis in that stumpage will not appear as a cost. Even more important at this time will be the saving in time and the encouragement to contractors to begin operations promptly. Small operators especially will be relieved of the necessity for paying for stumpage in advance of receiving payment for their product. The present situation is embarrassing to the forest officers, who are anxious to have the resources of the national forests used to the fullest extent in connection with the war activities of the Nation.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will.

Mr. HAUGEN. The cost will be the same whether you buy it in the stumpage or not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Well, I do not know about that.

Mr. HAUGEN. If you pay more for the finished product, of course, the receipts for the raw product are going back to the Treasury.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. And in the end the cost will be exactly the same. Now, it seems to me the language proposed here is broad language which gives power for the wholesale disposal of this valuable timber and only 30 days' time can be gained.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yet that time is exceedingly valuable. Now, let me explain to the gentleman what has happened in reference to spruce timber. The Government here in the last month made a contract with the Grant Smith Co., a nationally known firm of contractors, for the delivery of 5,000,000 feet of spruce a month, and the company went at once to the southwestern Washington district and tried to find that spruce. They went south from Grays Harbor, the spruce-belt center, to the North River country and found plenty of spruce there, about one tree in every five being valuable for aeroplane stock, and even these suitable trees are not all accessible. This big firm now admits that it has a very hard contract. The trees are there. It costs money to fell them. When one falls into a ravine it can not be drawn from there except with a donkey engine, and this work does not permit the putting in of heavy logging machinery to get out the spruce trees alone. Now, I want to say to the gentleman this amendment has the approval of the Agricultural Department. It resulted from an effort to coordinate the War Department and the Agricultural Department.

The same difficulty existed in trying to coordinate the Indian Commissioner's Office of the Interior Department and the War Department. Last week the House corrected that. Anyone who has had experience in trying to get these things the War Depart-

ment needs from other departments will discover in a minute that the difficulty is to get the departments to a point where they will agree on what should be done. This amendment comes from the office of the Secretary of Agriculture and is the result of much effort to find some way by which the United States Government, for war purposes, can get out of the great spruce belt in my district twice as much spruce as is now in sight for aeroplane stock.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MAYS in the chair). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. HAUGEN. I take it that much of the timber is sold above the appraised value?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. The proposition provides for the selling of the timber at the appraised value?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But the Forestry Service follows the War Department's price in this case. Spruce is selling for \$7.50 a thousand feet in the tree. The price of spruce stumpage has ranged around \$2 and \$2.50 in years past.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is \$2.50 the appraised value?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think about that; or, say, \$3 a thousand. In normal years forestry sale of timber is made on an appraised valuation that runs with the valuation of stumpage in private hands in that section.

Mr. HAUGEN. As I understand the gentleman, this would leave it entirely to the discretion of the forester to determine the price?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In the case of a war emergency.

Mr. HAUGEN. It must be not less than the appraised value?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Absolutely. The timber that is wanted now is many times its normal commercial price.

Mr. HAUGEN. With the appraised price of \$2 or \$2.50 and the selling price at \$7.50, it leaves open the door at \$2.50 instead of \$7.50.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The War Department has fixed the price at \$7.50 for spruce.

Mr. HAUGEN. Suppose it would be fixed at \$2.50 and it would sell at \$2.50, the Forest Department would be a loser to the extent of \$5?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Before the United States went into the war the British Government and the French Government scoured that country for spruce and paid a tremendous price for it, far in excess of what our War Department is now paying. The present regulated price is the result of an understanding between ourselves and our allies as to the price of sawed and rived spruce. In the meantime, spruce trees available for aeroplane stock, and within the reach of transportation, have been very largely collected.

Mr. LEVER. Let me ask the gentleman from Washington if the statement he is reading from is a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; this is a memorandum only. I have a statement of indorsement from the Bureau of Forestry, however, along the same line. The Agricultural Department, the War Department, and the Forestry Bureau, all are anxious that crews of men should go into the timber and rive spruce; that is, hand-hew it. This amendment came from the office of the Acting Forester, who caused it to be drafted after I had appealed to him for an amendment that would cut the Gordian knot, so that the War Department could secure from the Agricultural Department the spruce that is needed to make the aeroplanes this Congress has authorized.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, no one, I take it, from the remarks of the gentleman from Washington and the observations of the gentleman from Iowa, takes issue with that provision which relates to allowing the War Department to go into our national forests and cut down any trees they may see fit to do, but there may be a serious question as to whether we should grant authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to allow private contractors to go there and obtain timber at the appraised value, merely to gain 30 days. They have the privilege to-day, as I understand it, or, rather, the Secretary of the Interior has the privilege to-day, of waiving that 30-day requirement, subject to the condition that if any person in the 30-day period bids more, the private contractor should pay that additional price.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now, we have large contractors with Government contracts on hand. They have estimated what the cost of the raw material will be under existing conditions. They have taken that into consideration that other bidders might raise the price of the timber, and yet we are waiving that absolutely and giving them that profit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; we are not.

Mr. STAFFORD. No one here desires to place any obstacle in the way of the War Department or even of private contractors getting the necessary material for construction work necessary for war purposes. And yet, here the gentleman springs a proposition that even has not the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, but merely prepared by the Forestry Bureau.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think the amendment was prepared in the legal department of the Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The intimation is made that there might be some additional profit made by some contractor, which is not the case at all. The gentleman must understand that after the United States joined with its allies in the handling of spruce stock—that is, the spruce brought down to the mill—the Government fixed the price for sawed spruce at \$110 per thousand feet, and for rived spruce \$90 a thousand, with a bonus of \$40 if it could be produced by the 31st day of January, and a \$30 bonus if it was produced after the 1st day of January, and before a certain later date. Now, the Government is not only paying that great price but paying bonuses, and still they can not get enough crews to go far into the woods and bring out the spruce, of which the War Department has announced that it and our allies need a hundred million feet at once.

Mr. STAFFORD. But nothing has been shown by the gentleman to prove that they are meeting obstacles by reason of the 30-day provision.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; except this: "Thirty days" does not sound serious, but anybody who ever tries to cut any red tape usually finds that "30 days" quickly runs into 130 days. It took a year and a half to get at the cutting of spruce out there on the Indian reservations.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the law allows the Secretary to waive that 30-day requirement; but the contractor must do it subject to the condition that if anyone bids more, he must pay that price.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. When I asked the Forest Service to make such a waiver, they were rather afraid it could not be effective even if they had the authority. When the contractors are asking to be allowed to go and get this timber, they are suspicious lest, before they have completed their contract at this already high price of spruce, somebody else would step in and bid for spruce at a still higher price—at which the latest bidder might never deliver—and it would embarrass them. The real price will be the War Department's price, bid or no bid. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection to the proposition of vesting the War Department with power to go into the national forests and take all the timber it sees fit for war purposes, but the other proposition is, in my opinion, open to serious objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Here is the Federal Government owning in the Olympic Peninsula millions upon millions of spruce timber, but very little of it, of course, is available on account of lack of transportation. Here is the War Department of the Government clamoring for spruce and offering a bonus to get spruce within a few days, and here is the Agricultural Department willing and anxious to help the War Department, but afraid to cut the red tape without an act of Congress. I hope the Congress will come to the rescue. This applies to the period of the war only.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is a price set on it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes. When the War Department says \$7.50 for stumpage, that will be the price agreed upon. That price is high, but it may be higher. A crew of 10 men can go in and find half a dozen of these trees, fell them, rive out the pieces, and drag them out, and get them to a road somewhere and bring them to tidewater.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I suggest to the gentleman from Washington that he permit this amendment to go over, so that we can have opportunity to examine it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will agree to that.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment be passed over without prejudice, and that we may return to it later, with a point of order pending against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that this amendment be passed over temporarily without prejudice, still reserving a point of order upon it. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

And hereafter, in lieu of actual transportation expenses, the Secretary of Agriculture may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, authorize the payment of not to exceed 2 cents per mile for a motorcycle or 6 cents per mile for an automobile used for necessary travel on official business in the Forest Service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is a new provision of law. It is also something novel in the history of legislation, providing for allowances for the use of automobiles. I assume that the committee has in mind compensating those connected with the Forest Service who happen to own an automobile or a motorcycle by giving them an allowance at the rate of 2 cents a mile for a motorcycle and 6 cents per mile for the use of an automobile when used on necessary travel in connection with official business. Will the chairman advise us as to what investigation was had as to the rate determined in this item, and whether this was recommended by the department?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; this item was recommended by the department and submitted in the Book of Estimates. It is now costing the Forest Service something like \$32,000 a year for automobile service. They figure that with this authority submitted here—2 cents a mile for motorcycles and 6 cents a mile for automobiles—they could make a very distinct saving in the amount of money expended for travel in the national forests. The committee looked into the matter carefully—for instance, into the question of 6 cents a mile—and considered whether that was reasonable or not. While I do not own an automobile myself, members of the committee do own them, and I think they all agree that that is a very reasonable charge, and that is also true as to motorcycles.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Would it not be well to limit this by some such language as this, that "motorcycles and automobiles which have been furnished and the maintenance of which is paid by the Federal Government ought not to be included" in this? Some of these machines are supplied by the Government, and money is supplied for their upkeep. Now, the use of those ought not to be paid for in this way, it seems to me, by the Federal Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, when I first read this paragraph I assumed that it related only to an allowance to those in the Government service who owned in their own right an automobile.

Mr. LEVER. That was certainly the idea of the committee, and then I think—

Mr. STAFFORD. There may be some strength in the position of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] that it should be qualified so as to apply expressly only to those that are privately owned by Government employees.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. If the gentleman will permit me further, I think I am right in the impression that some of these machines are owned privately and some are furnished by the Government, and the cost of the upkeep is paid by the department out of money recommended by this committee.

Mr. LEVER. As a matter of fact, the Forest Service owns quite a number of automobiles, but it never occurred to me, nor, I think, to the committee, that this would authorize the department—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The chairman will recall that when the language came from the department it did not contain the words on lines 13 and 14, "under such regulations as may be prescribed." I offered that amendment, and it was adopted by the committee, and I had in mind the control of just such a situation. But it occurs to me now that there is not enough to that language. It is not specific enough.

Mr. LEVER. I wish the gentleman would offer an amendment to make it entirely specific.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. In case the officer or employee furnishes his own machine and pays for its upkeep, there is good reason for this provision.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. But in case the department owns the machine and pays for its upkeep, the person who operates it should not in addition to his salary be paid for running it or be compensated by the mile for the travel he makes in it.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, undoubtedly not; and if this language is not strong enough to provide against it, if the gentleman will frame an amendment to cover it, I shall have no objection to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that under the existing practice those connected with the Forest Service who own automobiles or motor cycles and use them in the discharge of their official duties receive nothing in the way of transportation expenses?

Mr. LEVER. That is true. There is no provision by which the owner of an automobile using it even on official business for the department can now receive reimbursement.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, on what basis did the department estimate that \$32,000 would be saved if this language was incorporated in the law?

Mr. LEVER. The department do not estimate that they will save \$32,000. They estimate that it is now costing the Forest Service for its automobiles and motor cycles \$32,000 a year. They estimate that there will be some saving, just how much I do not recall.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee who bears the expense of the upkeep of the horses that are used by the rangers in the Forest Service?

Mr. LEVER. That question has been asked by the committee. I will say offhand—if I am not correct, I will correct it in my printed remarks—that the ranger himself pays that expense. I think that was the testimony before the committee a year or so ago.

Mr. STAFFORD. That was my impression—that the rangers and assistant rangers pay for the upkeep of their horses.

Mr. LEVER. That is my recollection.

Mr. STAFFORD. If that is the case, we are making an exception in providing for the upkeep of automobiles in the Forest Service while not providing for the horses of the rangers and assistant rangers who use steeds.

Mr. LEVER. I may be mistaken about that. I will find out.

Mr. STAFFORD. That was my impression from my visits to the national forests and my conversations with the rangers—that they were obliged to feed their own horses.

Mr. LEVER. That they furnish their own horses and equipment and feed.

Mr. DOWELL. Does the gentleman know what proportion of these automobiles are owned and maintained by the Government?

Mr. STAFFORD. This provision, as the gentleman says, is for the purpose of compensating employees who own their own automobiles.

Mr. DOWELL. I understand; but it has been stated here in the discussion that the Government owns part of the automobiles. I am asking what proportion of the automobiles are owned and maintained by the Government?

Mr. LEVER. I can not tell the gentleman that. I know that the automobiles in the Forest Service are costing the Government \$32,000 a year. We have a list of them.

Mr. DOWELL. Does the gentleman mean that the automobiles owned by the department are costing the Government that?

Mr. LEVER. For the upkeep, expense, and the like of that.

Mr. DOWELL. The ones owned by the Government.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. I understand that up to this time there has been no payment to persons with automobiles, except those maintained by the department.

Mr. LEVER. That is true.

Mr. DOWELL. Then the purpose of this, as I understand it, is to go beyond the automobiles owned by the department and to use this money in compensation of persons who own their own automobiles.

Mr. LEVER. Persons who are operating Government-owned automobiles in the Forest Service now receive nothing for gasoline and other expenses except their own salaries. The purpose of this proposition is that if a forest ranger, for instance, owns a little Ford automobile and is using it on official business, he may get reimbursement at the rate of 6 cents per mile.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman think that, in view of the fact that at present rangers are obliged to pay for the upkeep of their horses, this matter ought to be deferred?

If we are going to give consideration to the employee who happens to have an automobile and allow him the cost of its upkeep, why should we not do the same for the ranger who has a horse? The same principle is involved.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman think we ought to pass it, over or to let it go out on a point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I think we ought to pass it over until the committee have considered both these subjects together.

Mr. LEVER. I will not shed any tears over that course.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] has an amendment that I think will take care of it.

Mr. DOWELL. One further question. Is the question of expense taken into consideration in fixing the compensation in these cases?

Mr. LEVER. Out of the 6 cents per mile?

Mr. DOWELL. No; at the present time. The gentleman has stated that there is no provision now for the expense that is attempted to be covered by the 6 cents a mile.

Mr. LEVER. There is not.

Mr. DOWELL. I am asking if at the present time the compensation does not cover the expenses?

Mr. LEVER. The salary?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I take it that it does not, or else the department would not make this recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. May I make a very brief statement in this connection?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I have in the last year met several forestry officials, head rangers, assistant superintendents, and so forth, who owned automobiles, flivvers, and who were operating them entirely at their own expense. They felt, and I think they were justified in that view, that their duties required these machines, and that they could perform very much more effective service by having them. They get around so much more rapidly in these parts of the forest reserve where there are roads on which a machine can be used. They have felt, however, that while they were using machines on public business they ought not to be required to pay all of the expenses of the maintenance of the machine, that there should be some provision made similar to this in the bill. I did not know that the committee had taken that matter into consideration and made provision for it. In view of my talk with the men and the knowledge of the situation, I should say that it was a very wise provision and in the interest of the public service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman recognize the fact that if we adopt this provision it will be a discrimination in favor of the officials who own automobiles and a discrimination against the ranger who is obliged to purchase his horse and maintain him out of his salary?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not look at it in that way. In the first place it costs comparatively little to maintain a horse, particularly in the summer time on a forest reserve. The horses feed on the grasses in the main, and they are fed little grain, for they do not require it. Furthermore, some of these very men that have automobiles also have horses, probably the most of them. They could use horses and travel about at a very much slower pace. The use of the automobile enables them to get around more quickly over the territory and render better and more effective service. It seems to me a wise provision and I can think of other branches in the public service where a provision of this kind would be helpful and wise. I think it is better than a liberal appropriation for the purchase of automobiles. If you can get an individual to buy an automobile and give him a small sum for the use of it you get the use of the automobile at a lower cost than if the automobile was owned by the Government.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield to me out of my own time?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; I am much obliged to the gentleman for yielding me so much time.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Michigan has an amendment, which I would like to have the Clerk read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 45, line 17, at the end of line 17, add the following:
 "Provided, That there shall be no payment of mileage for the use or travel of motorcycle or automobile furnished or owned by or maintained by the Government of the United States."

Mr. LEVER. I have another suggestion which I think might be wise in this connection. We are making this permanent law, and I think we had better strike out the word "hereafter" and try it and see what report we get from it, if Members have no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That would be striking out the word "hereafter" in the second line. I have no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

Line 12, after the word "and," strike out the word "hereafter."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 45, line 12, after the word "and," strike out the word "hereafter."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I recognize what the gentleman from Wyoming has said, that this will be a saving to owners of automobiles in the way of having the Government provide for their upkeep to a certain extent, and yet it is certain, if we pass this provision, that we will be presented next year with a demand from the rangers who maintain their horses to have us provide for the upkeep of their horses. I have no objection to trying it out for a year, and I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph and amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not concede the point of order. This is a provision which undoubtedly, from all the testimony we have, reduces expenditures, and I think it would fairly fall within the Holman rule.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the clause is not subject to a point of order. It simply relates to the manner in which the necessary public business shall be carried on, for the department to provide the means of transportation, the means by which these men can carry on their business, the same as they provide houses for the men built at public expense. The department has determined that one of the better ways of having the public business transacted out there is to pay mileage for travel of those engaged in the business. It seems to me it relates to the manner of conducting the public business.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very clear that this comes within the rule. There is no question that it is subject to a point of order. It is new legislation, an entire change of law on the subject.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. What law on the subject?

Mr. DOWELL. The methods by which business is transacted.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. What is the method fixed by law for men traveling in the national forest?

Mr. DOWELL. I will say to the gentleman that he is attempting to legislate here a different and special method which is different from the method now carried on.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The method adopted heretofore is not fixed by law; it is a regulation of the department.

Mr. HOWARD. What is the method of transporting these rangers from one part of the forest reserve to another? Does the Government expect the men to walk?

Mr. DOWELL. That is not the question; the question of what method shall be adopted is not the question here. It is a question of order, whether or not this section changes the plan of conducting this business.

Mr. HOWARD. Wherein does it change the method?

Mr. DOWELL. It changes it, and therefore it comes within the rule.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me ask the gentleman if it does not make law?

Mr. DOWELL. Certainly; it does make law regulating this question, not only now but hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MAYS). The point of order is sustained.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Does the Chair hold this out of order if the word "hereafter" is eliminated?

The CHAIRMAN. The word "hereafter" has been stricken out, and the Chair thinks the paragraph is new legislation and is subject to the point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. Under the Holman rule new legislation is permitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the handling, grading, packing, canning, freezing, storing, and transportation of fish, and for experimental shipments of fish, for the utilization of waste products, and the development of new sources of food, \$14,000.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 49, line 5, strike out "experimental" and insert the word "experimental."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the biological investigation of food and drug products and substances used in the manufacture thereof, including investigations of the physiological effects of such products on the human organism, \$15,000.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to have the chairman, if he has the figures in mind, to indicate to us what portion of the Agricultural appropriation bill's fund goes to negative sources to counteract disease, and so forth, and what amount goes to positive effort to increase rather than to conserve. Has the chairman made any estimate on that score?

Mr. LEVER. No; I have not; but my familiarity with this bill would lead me to say that the larger part of the work of the Department of Agriculture at this time is being expended in the direction of increased production rather than along the line of research. I take it that is what the gentleman means.

Mr. FESS. That is the substance of my question.

Mr. LEVER. Of course, you would have to except the Forest Service from that statement.

Mr. FESS. I notice in the Animal Industry item that it was about 8 to 3 in favor of the negative, or remediable, activity.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. And I had not examined the vegetable items with this point in mind.

Mr. LEVER. It would be found to be pretty well true with the Bureau of Plant Industry, but when you come to the States Relations Service and some of the other services the Bureau of Markets, for instance, it will be seen that a great deal of their work is in the other direction—conservation and production.

Mr. FESS. I notice the Bureau of Chemistry is almost entirely devoting its time to the finding of new means of increasing production rather than counteracting any agencies that are designed to decrease it.

Mr. LEVER. That is very true.

Mr. FESS. How does the Bureau of Chemistry stand in comparison with such organizations in other countries?

Mr. LEVER. I have made no investigation of my own to form a judgment based upon original investigation, but I take it, and have always been told by people, that the Bureau of Chemistry is one of the great organizations of its kind in the world, probably the greatest.

Mr. FESS. I am asking that because as one somewhat familiar with university research work I recall that the Bureau of Chemistry here at Washington has been regarded as one of the most advanced in its research work, not only in this country but of any in any country.

Mr. LEVER. That has been my information also, and I am glad to find the gentleman feels the same way. I regard the chief of that bureau as one of the big men in the Government service.

Mr. COX. Who is the chief?

Mr. LEVER. Dr. Alsberg.

Mr. FESS. Is it not rather exceptional that we can hold such men at the command of the Government at the salaries paid with such solicitations in other fields that might take them out?

Mr. LEVER. It is absolutely remarkable that many of the greatest men in their lines of work in the world are working at salaries that range from \$3,500 to \$4,500 a year. The only explanation that has been given is that they are devoted to their work, and that in the Government service they have the machinery with which to work, and there is the other reason that their tenure of office is more certain.

Mr. FESS. We in the past have suffered considerably from the loss of some of these research men, have we not?

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. FESS. Are we losing many now?

Mr. LEVER. We are losing men every day from the Department of Agriculture who are going into private industries whom we can ill afford to lose.

Mr. FESS. However, there is no possibility of curing that difficulty by a general increase in salary?

Mr. LEVER. None whatever.

Mr. FESS. We have to depend upon the devotion of these research men to work for the Government, and especially to the work of research for the sake of knowledge.

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly. You can not correct it by salary.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigation and experiment in the utilization, for coloring purposes, of raw materials grown or produced in the United States, in cooperation with such persons, associations, or corporations as may be found necessary, including repairs, alterations, improvements, or additions to a building on the Arlington Experimental Farm, \$70,720.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to inquire from the chairman of the committee what particular work is being done under this appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. I would say to the gentleman from North Dakota that he will recall that about two years ago this item was inserted. It was inserted for the reason that this country was practically dependent upon Germany for dyestuffs. They have now gotten the work in fairly good shape and are cooperating very closely with the Bureau of Standards. The testimony before the committee tells us that they have now discovered the bases, or whatever you would call it, for the colors red and blue, and from these they hope, of course, to get a good many collateral colors. The purpose of this item is, if possible, to put this country on an absolutely independent footing with respect to dyes.

Mr. NORTON. I had in mind that experiments were being made in respect to the production of aniline dyes, coal-tar dyes, and mineral dyes. It occurred to me that these experiments and investigations were being made by the Bureau of Standards and by the Bureau of Mines, and that large appropriations were made for that purpose last year in other bills. I would like to know what real work, if any, the Department of Agriculture has been doing on this subject, and whether the Agricultural Department is doing any independent research work, or whether it is merely duplicating work being done by the Bureau of Standards and Bureau of Mines, to discover new processes of manufacturing dyes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. When this item was first inserted in the Agricultural appropriation bill the question was raised as to which department had better take it up, and it was stated at that time that consideration had been given to that by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior and the chief of the Bureau of Standards, and it was thought it had better be taken up by the Department of Agriculture; hence the first appropriation suggested for that purpose.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman mean to convey the information to the committee that the chief experiments that are being made by the Government to develop in this country the dye industry are being carried on under this appropriation by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will say that there is a perfect understanding between those who are carrying on the work along this line so that there is no duplication. The kind of work provided for in this appropriation is being done wholly by the Department of Agriculture. There will be no encroachment and, as I say, no duplication of work.

Mr. NORTON. Well, does the gentleman know, so that he can tell the committee, what particular work the Department of Agriculture is doing, if any; what particular work of investigation or experimentation is being carried on by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. I will yield if the gentleman has any information he can give on the subject.

Mr. TOWNER. I am sure I do not know; I could not label it in advance. But the gentleman knows that dye products are produced both from mineral and vegetable products?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. And that it is necessary that we should have both; in fact, it is necessary very often to use them in combination. As I understand it, the Bureau of Standards is principally occupying their attention, and to a very large degree, with the development of dyestuffs that are obtained from minerals.

Mr. NORTON. Yes; and also the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. TOWNER. And the Agricultural Department is engaged in its proper sphere in developing, as it can, dye substances from vegetable products, which is perfectly proper.

Mr. NORTON. Can the gentleman tell me anything the Department of Agriculture has done along this line in securing results or making new discoveries within the last year or two?

Mr. LEVER. I can give the gentleman that information if I can pronounce the words.

Mr. NORTON. I will yield to the chairman of the committee if he can give us a little information on the subject.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, when it was first suggested two years ago that the Government should undertake some activity looking to the furtherance of the dye industry, the question arose whether or not the Bureau of Standards or the Department of Agriculture should undertake the work. There was correspondence had between the Director of the Bureau of Standards and the Secretary of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may have three minutes more to get a little information on this subject if possible. I have not obtained any so far.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. At that time it was agreed between the two respective heads that the work of the two bureaus was entirely distinct and different, and that the Department of Agriculture should undertake the work of chemical analysis of the various coloring substances and as to the processes of manufacture, and that the Bureau of Standards should only consider the question as to the standardization of colors; that analyses and all the work that goes into the determination of the processes of manufacture should be undertaken by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman mean to convey to the committee the information that the Department of Agriculture is investigating dyestuffs made from mineral products?

Mr. STAFFORD. They are investigating the entire subject as to processes of manufacture and the chemical analyses of the various dyestuffs, and the Bureau of Standards is not engaged in that investigation.

Mr. NORTON. Now I will yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. LEVER. I was just going to read from the testimony of Dr. Alsberg:

Dr. ALSBERG. We have made, I think, in the two years that this appropriation has been available, very important progress. We have developed a new method for the production of the substance known as phthalic anhydride. This substance is the basis of one of the methods of making indigo. It is the basis of phenolphthalein, which is one of the most widely used laxatives. It is the basis of numerous and important series of dyes. In fact, it is one of the most important of all the intermediates. It is itself not a dye, but is converted into many useful dyestuffs of the series. I estimate that the annual consumption of phthalic anhydride, were it available in this country, would be something in the neighborhood of 5,000,000 pounds. We have developed a new method, which is now in commercial use actually producing this material, which, we feel, is capable of producing phthalic anhydride here more cheaply than anywhere else.

The CHAIRMAN. Anywhere in the world?

Dr. ALSBERG. Anywhere in the world. But I must make this reservation: We do not know just exactly what is going on inside of German dyestuff factories, or what has been going on. It may be that they have a secret method of which we know nothing which is as good as ours or better. As far as we know, however, that is not the case. So far as we can judge from the price that was paid for the material before the war, we believe that this particular method for making this very important intermediate is capable of producing it very much more cheaply than any other method that we know anything about.

Then he goes on with three or four more pages of testimony.

Mr. NORTON. That is dealing with vegetable dyes.

Mr. LEVER. Well, there are three or four more pages of testimony in which he gives results along other lines.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman understand, as stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin, that investigations by the Department of Agriculture are being made of mineral dyes?

Mr. LEVER. I think so. I do not think they are confined to vegetable dyes at all.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I think it is highly important that this appropriation be made for this purpose. There are many reasons why I have arrived at that conclusion. In the first place, let me say there are about \$100,000,000 worth of dyestuffs produced in the world annually. Seventy-five per cent of those dyestuffs are produced in Germany, or were before the war. The people of the United States consume annually \$15,000,000 worth, or about 15 per cent of all the dyestuffs manufactured in the world, and we were, before the war, practically producing none. There are 900 varieties of dyestuffs made and used in the world. We are now making in the United States, which industry has practically sprung up since this great war broke out in 1914, about 350 varieties of the 900 made and used in the world. Those dyestuffs are largely made from minerals. We have an abundance of raw material and capital and skill in the country to establish this industry in this country, so that

we may produce and keep in this country the \$15,000,000 worth of dyestuffs for which we heretofore sent abroad this money. The dyestuff industry can be converted into the explosive industry within a week's time at a trifling expense and, vice versa, the industry in which explosives are made can be converted into the dyestuff industry. A gentleman came before the Ways and Means Committee a few months ago and stated that he was engaged in coloring cotton goods, not manufacturing, but wholly engaged in coloring. He was in favor of a protective tariff upon dyestuffs that that industry might be established in this country, which has not, or had not prior to the war, been established here.

He stated that he purchased dyestuffs from abroad and purchased a certain quantity, for which he paid \$1,750 usually, and at the time he appeared before the committee, in 1915 or 1916, he had a shipment of that quantity on the way to this country from China, for which he was paying \$52,500. That is the difference between the price the manufacturers in this country that are manufacturing cotton goods and coloring them pay to-day for coloring, and the price they did pay, before the war in Europe. We need an appropriation, and we need some action on the part of this Government to establish that industry in the United States.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman knows that during the past two years several large dyestuff-manufacturing plants have been built up in the country.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes. I have just stated that we are now manufacturing in the United States from 300 to 350 varieties of the 900 varieties made in the world, nearly all of which industry has been established in this country since the declaration of war in 1914.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. COX. I thoroughly agree with everything the gentleman says, and that is one of the things I would vote for under the high-protective tariff. Here is the point I want to get at: Are our manufacturers in this country making as good a grade of dyestuffs as were formerly imported from Germany?

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say to the gentleman that the variety of dyestuffs made and used to-day are not of as high a grade as those used prior to the war, for this reason, that their cheapness recommends them at this time and until the industry becomes well established and we become skilled in that industry in this country. The skill in the manufacture of high-grade stuffs in this country, perhaps, is not as great as in the old country, where they had been experimenting and have been engaged in the industry for many years.

Mr. COX. As I recall, two years ago this last summer, or possibly a year ago, our State Department worked out an agreement with England whereby we were able to get a certain amount of dyestuffs imported from Germany in order to keep our Bureau of Engraving and Printing going. Do you know whether that which we imported is still running the Bureau of Engraving and Printing or are we running that plant on some of our own manufacture?

Mr. FORDNEY. I am not positive, but my information is that we are supplying that in this country.

Mr. COX. From our own manufacture?

Mr. FORDNEY. From our own manufacture.

Mr. COX. Has there ever been any secret, so far as Germany's success is concerned, in their dyeing industry? That is, have her chemists been in possession of any secrets that the chemists of the world do not know anything about?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will say to the gentleman that I do not believe there are any secrets to-day used in Germany in the manufacture of dyestuffs that are not known by the experts in this country.

Mr. COX. Then, if that be true, the only thing that our capitalists or the American people want is a protection against the German monopoly. Is not that true?

Mr. FORDNEY. I think that is right.

Let me state this for the information of the House. It is very interesting to me. A dyestuff manufacturer stated to me personally, and he also appeared before the committee—he made this statement, that he was engaged in marketing raw material for dyestuffs out of the products of salt brine pumped from beneath the ground in the State of Michigan. He is experimenting in making indigo from salt brine. He stated that he was making a certain chemical from salt in this country, and he found there was an excellent market in Germany for that product.

I will give the figures about as he gave them to me. I am not positive that I am exactly correct as to the dollars and cents. He was selling that product in this country for 37 cents a pound and manufacturing it for about 32 cents a pound. He sent agents to Germany and established a trade there and was doing a lucrative business at 42 cents a pound. Then, lo! and behold, a German representative of those industries in Germany came to his office, saw him in private, and said, "You are selling those dyestuffs in Germany and we want you to get out. I represent the dyestuff industries of Germany." My friend inquired, "Do you own the world?" "We think we own the German market, and it is for your best interest that you stop selling in Germany." There was no agreement reached. The German gentleman went away, my neighbor continued selling in Germany, and the first thing he knew that article was selling in this country from German manufacture at 22 cents a pound. He immediately withdrew his agent from Germany, and the price in this country went up to 37 cents a pound for German dyestuffs; and so he was obliged to keep out of Germany. This German gentleman said to him, "We have in Germany what we call a 'yellow-dog' fund, to which the manufacturers contribute one half and the Government the other half, and when we find it necessary to put an industry out of business in the United States or in any other country in the world we use that 'yellow-dog' fund and undersell you and put you out of business, and I advise you to get out of Germany." And my friend got out of Germany.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. JUUL. What I want to know is where was the protective tariff protecting this particular industry?

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, let me tell you. I did not get up to make a tariff speech, but I will ask you to bear with me a minute or two to explain that point, and I am not getting into politics.

Mr. JUUL. If the gentleman will permit me, I am asking you in good faith.

Mr. FORDNEY. I know that, and for that reason I will answer you in absolute good faith.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. I would like to have about 2 minutes myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say in good faith to the gentleman that there is no tariff law that can be enacted that will protect an industry of that kind when it meets such competition as that German gentleman described, unless we add to our tariff laws an antidumping clause such as Canada has to-day, and such as some other foreign countries, whose names I can not speak positively of now, have.

But Canada has this kind of a paragraph in her import law; that is to say, if an article of foreign manufacture is sold in Canada at a less price than it sells for in the country where it is made there is an additional duty of 15 per cent ad valorem added to the tariff rate when going into Canada, and if the article is on the free list there shall be a 15 per cent ad valorem duty placed upon it, and notice is given by the Canadian Government to that manufacturer that he can no longer ship into Canada, under any circumstances at all, unless he sells in Canada at a price equally as high as he obtains for that article in the country where he makes it.

That absolutely prohibits dumping at a price under cost of an article on our market or in the market of any country that has that kind of a law. If you have a reasonable rate of duty to offset the difference between our cost and the foreign cost, together with an antidumping clause, you can protect an industry and build it up in this country, where we have an abundance of raw material and capital and energy and skill, and under no other circumstances can it be done. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the development of the dye industry is tremendously important, and it naturally divides itself into several classes for investigation and research. It is entirely proper that the agricultural bill should carry a provision for investigation and experiment in the utilization for coloring purposes of raw materials grown in the United States, inasmuch as the Department of Agriculture has to do with the products grown in the United States and may properly carry on that kind of an investigation. The trouble is that, judging from the hearings had before the committee—and I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr.

FORDNEY], who is so much interested in this matter—the Agriculture Department has done almost everything except make any effort whatever to develop dyes from agricultural products—vegetable dyes. They told the committee that in the two years during which this appropriation had been running they had made important progress in a new method for the production of a substance known as thallie-hydrate. Thallie-hydrate, they tell us, however, is not a dye—it is a laxative; but it is, we are informed, the basis of an important series of dyes. It is an intermediate. We do not know that this new method will enable us to produce this product as cheaply as it must be produced in order to make it of commercial value, but we hope it will. They express, however, serious doubt about it.

Mr. NORTON. They could make quite a large hope on \$70,000.

Mr. MONDELL. So far as the hearings develop the facts, that is about all that has been accomplished. They have made some investigations into the production of dyes from metallic substances. In other words, except for the alleged discovery of a new process, of doubtful benefit or advantage, for the production of a laxative, which is also an intermediate of dyes, they seem to have done nothing under this appropriation.

The trouble often is with appropriations of this sort: no matter how well they may be intended or how useful a purpose they seek to serve, the departments or the bureaus receiving and using the appropriations are very likely to wander far afield from the actual purpose for which the appropriation was made, and that is, apparently, judging from the statement before the Committee on Agriculture, exactly what has been done in this case.

Now, we have a very considerable appropriation under the Bureau of Standards for the investigation of colors, dyes and dyestuffs, and dye manufactures. The matter is being investigated also by the Bureau of Mines, and properly so. The question divides itself into several classes of research and investigation, as I have suggested, and it is proper that the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Standards, and the Bureau of Mines, each within its own field, should follow and pursue proper lines of investigation and research. The Agriculture Department seems to have spent most of its money either in the fields that belong to the Bureau of Mines and the Bureau of Standards or in the discovery of an alleged but somewhat questionable new process for the manufacture of this laxative to which I have just referred. So far as the investigation of vegetable dyes are concerned, they seem to have forgotten all about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to inquire of the chairman of the committee as to the purpose of the phraseology found in this item to authorize this fund to be used "in cooperation with such persons, associations, or corporations as may be found necessary."

Mr. LEVER. The explanation given to the committee was that the department was now doing that very thing; that they were cooperating with persons, associations, and corporations in this work, but that they wanted to bring the fact to the attention of Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I understand that the department is sending its experts into the private establishments and aiding them in their laboratories in the development of these very processes of dye manufacture?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; getting information and helping as much as they can.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee how much of this fund is utilized in that way?

Mr. LEVER. No; I could not.

Mr. NORTON. Will the chairman of the committee tell the committee how much has been used for mileage out of this appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. I could tell the gentleman if I had a moment of time to look it up. It is all set out in the Book of Estimates here.

Mr. STAFFORD. Could the gentleman tell us what proportion of last year's appropriation of \$49,400 was used in the Bureau of Chemistry here in Washington for this work of determining new processes of manufacture and new dye formulas, or is most of the money spent in the field in connection with private establishments?

Mr. LEVER. They propose to spend this year in salaries \$31,320, and—if the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] will give me his attention—in travel, \$1,500, and for equipment and material, \$20,500; miscellaneous, \$2,400, and construction work, \$15,000. That is to complete their laboratory over at Arlington.

Mr. NORTON. How much did the gentleman say for mileage?

Mr. LEVER. One thousand five hundred dollars.

Mr. COX. That is not much.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman one question?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. There might be a misconception of the gentleman's answer a moment ago, that part of this money is being expended for development in private establishments. It would leave the impression that the Government is assisting private corporations.

Mr. LEVER. I did not intend to leave that impression, but the impression I intended to leave was that the Government is cooperating with these concerns in an endeavor to study the problem.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. Is it not true that it is impossible to understand the value of some of these experiments unless they are submitted to practical manufacturers?

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly that is true.

Mr. TOWNER. And they submit their processes and materials to manufacturers, who apply them and try them out to see whether or not they are efficacious.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of June 30, 1906, entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated, or misbranded, or poisonous, or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," in the city of Washington and elsewhere, including chemical apparatus, chemicals and supplies, repairs to apparatus, gas, electric current, official traveling expenses, telegraph and telephone service, express and freight charges, and all other expenses, employing such assistants, clerks, and other persons as may be considered necessary for the purposes named, and rent outside of the District of Columbia; and to cooperate with associations and scientific societies in the revision of the United States Pharmacopoeia and development of methods of analysis, \$589,081.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The Committee on Agriculture does such good work, and brings in a bill which in the main so thoroughly commends itself to the judgment of the House, and the gentlemen of that committee are always so kind and considerate during the discussion of the bill, that it is with profound regret that I rise to make a mild criticism.

We are all of us curious with regard to the items of the bill and the statements made in support of them, even though we may be fully convinced that the items are supported by excellent reasons. But, at any rate, the Members of the House are entitled to the information brought out at the hearings. There is one committee of this House, the name of which I shall not mention, that, I think, never comes into the House with a bill—and it brings several bills into the House—until and unless its hearings have been printed, bound, and well indexed, so that they are available for all the membership of the House. I think the Committee on Agriculture generally does that, but this year it did not, with the result that it is very difficult for one first to secure all of the record of the hearings and next to find the part or section of the record that has reference to the particular item under consideration. I do not think this is fair to the House. I think the committee owes an apology to the House for not having had its hearings properly bound and indexed for our information and consideration, and I hope that in the future that will be done.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit, let me say that if there is any dereliction at all, it is due to influences over which the committee had no control.

Mr. MONDELL. I felt that there must be a very excellent reason, although no reason is perfectly good.

Mr. LEVER. The Committee on Agriculture began the making up of the bill immediately after the hearings were closed. We made such good progress in getting together on the various items that the bill was reported before the hearings could be had from the printer and indexed by the clerk of the committee. The bill being reported promptly after its making up by the committee, there was not time to make an index. I think the gentleman's criticism would ordinarily be just, but in this case it is not, for the reason stated.

Mr. MONDELL. I feel confident that in the future the committee will endeavor to have the hearings indexed and accessible.

Mr. LEVER. We were trying to furnish some fodder for the House, and to do it rapidly.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the grading, weighing, handling, and transportation of naval stores, the preparation of definite type samples thereof, and for the demonstration of improved methods or processes of preparing naval stores, in cooperation with individuals and companies, including the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$10,000.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture a question or two. I do not want to ask anything that is captious or to have anyone think I feel that the committee has not given this bill thorough consideration; but I would like to know, with regard to this item at the bottom of page 50, whether this investigation of the grading, weighing, handling, and transportation of naval stores and the preparation of definite type samples thereof is for the benefit of the farmer, to help the agricultural interests of the country, or whether it is an auxiliary to the Navy? I have understood that everything was in such good shape in the Navy that they did not need any help, and what I would like to know is whether this is for the assistance of the farmer, to enable him better to market his product to the Navy, or whether it is an auxiliary to the Navy?

Mr. LEVER. This item was inserted in the bill about three years ago at the urgent request of the resin and turpentine producers of Florida, Georgia, and that section of the country, which produces large quantities of naval stores. Under this item they have now developed a type, with a view of standardizing the whole trade, and at this time a large part of this fund is being used for demonstrating to the producers and manufacturers the value of these types. We hope that this appropriation will not continue always.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and development of methods of manufacturing insecticides and fungicides, and for investigating chemical problems relating to the composition, action, and application of insecticides and fungicides, \$25,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

I believe this is a new item carried in the appropriation bill. Has this work ever been performed heretofore by the Department of Agriculture under its other authorizations?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the item is for developing cheaper methods of manufacturing insecticides and fungicides. The testimony before the committee shows that fungicides and insecticides have gone up enormously in price since this war began, and through this appropriation the department is undertaking to see if they can develop cheaper processes for manufacturing these things. They propose to employ some six or eight specialists on the work. It was pointed out that it was a very important matter. I happen to recall the statement of Dr. Howard, who was present when Dr. Alsberg was making his statement. He said that he desired to support the request of Dr. Alsberg for this small appropriation, to see if they could develop processes for cheapening the manufacture of insecticides particularly, and of fungicides also.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the cause of the increased price of these articles?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know, except the general rise in the prices of everything.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was wondering whether it was due to any combination of the few manufacturers engaged in this line of production.

Mr. LEVER. I really could not say. I take it that it is another evidence of the general rise in the prices of everything.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, as I understand, the department wishes to use this fund in experiments and in the investigation of methods to develop cheaper processes of manufacturing and give that knowledge to the public?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not to engage in the manufacture at all?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is merely to develop the processes, for the benefit of the public generally?

Mr. LEVER. That is all.

Mr. STAFFORD. To what extent are these insecticides and fungicides used?

Mr. LEVER. To a very large extent; just how large I can not say—that is, I do not know the total value.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman let me make a suggestion. The large increase is due to the arsenical preparations. They are used largely in the preparation of some of the ammunition, I do not know just how. There is a very large demand for it, and we have never developed the manufacture, I suppose, as we should. But for all the orchards and very many

garden crops arsenical preparations are necessary. The price of arsenic and all its derivatives has largely increased—three or four times what it was before the war.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is for the purpose of ascertaining some substitute?

Mr. TOWNER. No; it could not be a substitute for arsenical preparations, but it is to develop the manufacturing process which has not been taken care of in a scientific character, as perhaps the gentlemen think it ought to be. So this is for the development of the process of manufacture in order to have an abundance of the fundamental supply.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For chemical investigations of soil types, soil composition and soil minerals, the soil solution, solubility of soil and all chemical properties of soils in their relation to soil formation, soil texture, and soil productivity, including all routine chemical work in connection with the soil survey, \$25,010.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 52, line 10, in the last word of the line, insert the letter "1."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For exploration and investigation within the United States to determine possible sources of supply of potash, nitrates, and other natural fertilizers, \$31,340.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman what progress has been made in the work covered by this item, potash for fertilizer?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture, working through this appropriation, has discovered a large source of potash in connection with the cement-manufacturing establishments of this country. It appears that a large percentage of potash has been escaping through the chimneys of these factories. Some one some years ago discovered a process by which they could precipitate this potash and get it to the farmer for commercial use. Dr. Brown, who has charge of this matter, made this statement:

Our investigation of the cement industry covered every plant in the United States producing 100 barrels or more, and practically all the plants produce that much, and it showed that there was available annually seventy thousand and odd tons of potassium oxide, and that with a very slight change in the operation of the kilns 100,000 tons would be available, perhaps 150,000 tons. In normal times we use about 250,000 tons.

So in that respect we feel that progress has been made.

Mr. FESS. What about the nitrates?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. In that connection, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that some cement factories of the country have voluntarily changed their methods of operation and machinery so as to save this potash.

Mr. LEVER. That is very true; a number of large plants are installing this apparatus for precipitating the potash. I was about to discuss the work on kelp, but I recall that that is in another item, and I will defer it until we reach it.

Mr. FESS. That is another source of potash?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. I may say, while we are on that proposition, that the reports are that they are installing machinery and getting ready to manufacture potash out of kelp. They have had considerable trouble in getting the machinery, as its cost is considerable, and we are providing an item for overhead expenses.

Mr. FESS. The committee a year ago was very enthusiastic on the subject of deriving potash from kelp. Is the chairman satisfied with the progress made?

Mr. LEVER. Unless we can find some national deposit of potash our hope for very cheap potash is through kelp. I may be entirely mistaken about that, and I think some members of the committee disagree with that idea, but I have always had a strong belief in that proposition if we can get at it right.

Mr. FESS. I have understood that the source of potash from kelp is abundant.

Mr. LEVER. Absolutely inexhaustible.

Mr. FESS. Let me ask the gentleman, are we using coke ovens in any place for the production of nitrates?

Mr. LEVER. No; there is no Government plant as yet. They are about to establish a nitrate plant, but that is not carried in this bill. I may say, however, that there is a provision in this bill for the continuance of nitrogen work on the Arlington farm. My recollection is that I was told that they had not been permitted to erect a plant on account of the interference of the Fine Arts Commission, but that they were still working on the proposition.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, Dr. Brown, in discussing this matter of potash before the committee and discussing kelp as a source of supply, stated that the cost per unit was \$3, whereas the cost per unit of the potash received

from Germany prior to the commencement of the European war was 70 cents a unit; that the possibility of securing commercial potash from kelp was dependent entirely upon our ability to secure by-products from the ash. But he held out the hope to us that in the cement industry there is an opportunity to secure a supply of potash. In fact, he says it is our one best bet, because this electric precipitator apparatus, which has been installed in cement plants of the country, is a great service to the plant in that it serves to solve for them their dust problem. They claim that they can get 5 or 6 pounds of potash to every barrel of cement, and the possibilities are that we can secure over 100,000 tons of potash a year from the cement industry.

But he does not say, however, what would be the cost per unit of potash secured in that way. The apparatus is said to be very expensive, costing \$40,000 or \$50,000 in some instances. The question is whether or not we have any probability of getting potash by this method at a price that will enable us to compete with German potash. It is a very doubtful matter. However, inasmuch as these expenditures are small, as long as they hold out any hope at all, there is no reason why we should not give every dollar that the department has asked for.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Has the gentleman any source of information in regard to the actual production of this potash from cement, whether there have been any machines already made and put into operation?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes; Dr. Brown says that in a number of plants it has been installed and is working satisfactorily. He named several plants, and said that one or two had voluntarily installed the apparatus because of the great advantage it is to the plant.

Mr. TILSON. So that it has actually been done and it is only a question now of doing it economically enough to make it worth while.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is the only question, and Dr. Brown states as the result of his experiments that it is our one best bet. After reading the testimony in the hearing I am of the same opinion, that we have more hope of securing potash which can be sold cheaply to the farmers from that source than from any other source. If they can discover any plan by which they can obtain other by-products from the use of kelp, there is some hope there; but one thing is certain, and that is that the experience of every country in this war is that production has decreased. Since 1914 the amount of potash used in this country has been negligible, and with the continued cultivation of the soil there can be but one result, and that is a decreased productivity of the soil, and at a time when the farmers are crying that there is a shortage of labor, which also adds to the decreased productivity of the soil, we find it aggravated by the absence of potash. Any expenditure that is made to encourage the department to experiment and go the limit in obtaining a source of supply I believe to be money well spent.

Mr. BORLAND. I understood the gentleman to say that some cement plants had already installed this electric precipitator.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. So Dr. Brown stated.

Mr. BORLAND. Did they install it at their own expense; did they regard it as a commercial proposition for them to install it?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is my understanding of the testimony.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It was at their own expense.

Mr. BORLAND. Was the idea of taking it up to make potash or to keep the dust down?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Keeping the dust down. They are looking at it from that standpoint alone. That is the statement of Dr. Brown. At the same time, the revenue from the potash during the continuance of the war will be considerable and will contribute to offset the expense of installing the apparatus. In the clay used in making cement there is some potash and the apparatus serves to save this potash, which has heretofore been wasted. The object of the department now is to convince the cement industry of the wisdom of installing this apparatus.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for 10 minutes on this item.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in connection with that I ask unanimous consent that debate on the item and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and

amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, and that the gentleman from Wyoming have those 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, at the outbreak of the European war the United States and all the world was confronted with a very serious situation in regard to potash. Prior to the war practically all the world supply of potash came from Germany, where it is found in its native state in very large quantities, and where it can be mined and produced at a very low price. It was sold at 70 cents a unit of 20 pounds in our country before the war, and it could probably have been sold for half that sum if it had been necessary to do it, and still leave a large profit. At the beginning of the war this supply was cut off. It became necessary to develop supplies at home if possible. Naturally we were anxious to aid every governmental agency that offered any hope whatever for the development of potash from investigations and demonstrations. An appropriation was made in the Agricultural bill for the purpose of exploration, investigation, and to determine possible sources of a supply of potash. It was explained at the time that the explorations and investigations intended were those that properly came within the purview of the Agricultural Department. They proposed to examine the kelps, an agricultural product, and other like sources of possible potash supply, and some work along that line was done under this item. But here again we have an illustration of the evil, creeping in and growing at all times on all of these bills, of a department or a bureau of a department having an appropriation for one purpose, finding it impossible to develop along the lines of that purpose advantageously, and then branching out into the domain of other bureaus and departments of the Government. According to the hearings had before the committee, this sum of \$31,300 has been expended for the purpose of finding out and stating to the committee that potash can be secured from the dust produced in the manufacture of cement. Any of us could have learned that by the simplest inquiry, without the expense of anything more than the sum necessary to address a letter of inquiry. We are told that certain plants have begun the manufacture of potash from cement, and the department has issued what it calls an exhaustive bulletin, setting forth the fact that with the installation of an apparatus for recovering the flue dust on all of the cement plants in the United States, it will be possible to produce 100,000 tons of potash from that source. That is one-half our normal annual consumption of potash. So that if these cement factories do install these appliances—and three or four of the largest in the country have—we will secure a large supply of potash from that source. However, the use of potash can be very largely increased, of course, and ought to be.

According to the statement made before the committee, this particular work, which was undertaken entirely outside of the proper domain and jurisdiction of the Agricultural Department and within the field of activity of the Bureau of Mines or of the Department of Commerce, was never contemplated at the time the appropriation was granted, and it has now been completed, and yet the item remains in the bill—the \$31,300 is still with us. In the hearings it is stated that that is the investigation this item relates to. Is it proposed to build any of these mills? Oh, no; we could not do that without building a cement plant. Is it proposed to encourage the building of these by-product mills? No; because that encouragement only comes from the results of the operation of mills that are already in the business. It costs from \$50,000 to \$100,000 in each case, and it is only profitable by reason of the present very high price of potash. It would not be profitable if the price of potash were reduced to anywhere near its price level prior to the war. Potash now is selling at about \$5 per unit and as high as \$7 per unit, as against a price of 70 cents per unit, a price which, by the way, we protested vehemently through diplomatic channels before the war began. Of course at the present high price these cement mills can take up the work and, I hope, make it pay.

They are taking it up, but they did not take it up in the first instance by reason of any suggestion from the Agricultural Department. The hearings demonstrate they have been using \$31,000 a year to discover that what is being done can be done, and if it were done extensively enough it would produce a lot of potash. That is very valuable information so far as it goes.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. For a very brief question.

Mr. BORLAND. They are not using any of this money in regard to the nitrate investigation. That question has been taken up in an entirely different way.

Mr. MONDELL. No, as far as the hearings would indicate. On the next page of this bill there is a new item. Not satisfied with the expenditure of \$31,000 along the line of a pursuit that

does not belong to the Department of Agriculture at all, which belongs in the field of manufacture, with the field of mineral production—not satisfied with that, there is a new item of \$127,000 for the purpose of completing and running a factory for the manufacture of potash from kelp out on the Pacific coast. After we have completed it and reach a point where we can actually produce potash, we do not now produce it, but we produce only the ash of kelp and sell that to those who do produce potash from it; after we have completed our plant and proven that we can actually manufacture potash, we expect to produce 5 tons per day, or 1,500 tons of potash per year, as against 200,000 tons consumption. We hope, or the department officials said they hoped, to produce it at a cost of \$3 per unit of 20 pounds at the present time. If that hope were realized we could sell the product at a profit. But why should the Government enter upon or pursue an enterprise that has been entered upon and is being pursued in a commercial way and on a large scale by a number of private individuals and corporations? There are now a number of those plants on the Pacific coast producing the ash and the potash from the kelp. We can demonstrate nothing by our investigation or pursuit of this line of manufacture that will not be developed and can not be developed by private enterprise. We simply are entering upon a manufacturing enterprise in no way related to agriculture, except the potash is used in agriculture as a fertilizer, and entering upon it in a way that promises no hope of the development of new ideas or new processes, entering upon it along the line of private enterprises and in competition with them.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. If we are going to continue—

Mr. MADDEN. How many institutions are there in the United States doing the thing that the Government now proposes to do with the expenditure of \$127,000?

Mr. MONDELL. I notice in the hearings several referred to; whether there are more I do not know.

Mr. MADDEN. This is a duplication of what they are already doing?

Mr. MONDELL. It is a duplication of what is being done by private enterprise.

Mr. MADDEN. There is not a new idea in the thing the Government proposes to do?

Mr. MONDELL. Nothing new at all. The Government is doing it in the same way that private enterprise is doing it and will do it—simply a manufacturing industry manufacturing right alongside with private manufacturing industries at a large expense. Of course, the private enterprise, if packed with capital, can increase its plant and introduce economies the Government can not, so that we are actually at a disadvantage as an experiment with the private concern.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired, and, without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation of soils, in cooperation with other branches of the Department of Agriculture, other departments of the Government, State agricultural experiment stations, and other State institutions, and for indicating upon maps and plats, by coloring or otherwise, the results of such investigations, \$198,200.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee something in relation to this item. I notice that it starts with an investigation of soils in cooperation with other branches of the Department of Agriculture, evidently with various State agricultural stations, and then it refers to coloring maps and plats. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the item is a very large one for the latter purpose. I suppose the chairman of the committee has details as to what portion of the \$198,000 is to be expended actually in investigating soils and what in drawing pictures of it. It seems to me some explanation of this item might be of value.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, this item has not been changed in amount for four or five years. It is the regular soil-survey item of the Department of Agriculture, through which the department sends its experts into the field to ascertain the character of soil within certain areas, and then not only draws a map of the territory covered but furnishes, in the form of a bulletin, a description of the soil and the kind of crops that will most likely grow profitably in the area. It is the regular soil-survey work that has been carried for many years in this bill without any change in language or the amount carried.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then, I understand the reference to maps and plats, by coloring or otherwise, is not for large drawings of

the findings of the investigations, but are in the form of a bulletin such as are distributed by the department?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; each Member of Congress is entitled to 2,000 bulletins descriptive of the area surveyed and platted in his district.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman will permit an addition there, the department, I understand, sends out these maps in colors, which indicate the character of the soil in a particular place.

Mr. LEVER. A certain color will indicate a certain kind of soil.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Just how is this done? Is there a corps of investigators sent out in one part of the country who continue their work until it is finished and then move on to another?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Then where do the State agricultural experiment stations and other State institutions come in?

Mr. LEVER. The fact of the matter is that most of the States in the Union are cooperating very earnestly in this line of work and they work in conjunction with each other.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman means that the State also sends out its experts and they go along with the Federal experts?

Mr. LEVER. As far as I know, I do not think the experiment stations proper are doing any soil-survey work except in connection with their own individual experiments. But a number of the States appropriate money with which to supplement the Federal fund. For instance, the State of Alabama some years ago made a considerable appropriation in order to have the Government come into the State and make the survey. And while none of these survey parties is under the control of the State, yet the State itself puts up a part of the expense.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman state whether they do this work intensively in spots and then move on to another place, or whether they try to cover the whole country?

Mr. LEVER. They have two kinds of soil surveys. One is what they call the reconnaissance work, which is done on a rather extensive scale. I mean to say by that that they do not make their soundings or findings as to soil in every 200, 300, or 400 yards, but they take a whole area, as on the western ranges, and give an idea of the type of soil they have there. But in the Eastern States, in the more populated sections, they make intensive surveys. They go into every county and into every community in the county and get the type of soil.

Mr. TILSON. How are they progressing in this work? Is it nearing completion? Are they getting the country mapped, practically?

Mr. LEVER. It is going to take many years to get the country properly mapped, but they are making good progress. For instance, the department is making the surveys in my own county, and I may say I did not ask for it. When it gets a little warmer this party will probably be sent to Connecticut, we will say. They try to handle the force so as to get the best results.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is the gentleman aware of how these particular parties are designated for the soil survey?

Mr. LEVER. I understand the department has a rule by which the survey must be asked for by some civil or official body within the county, like a chamber of commerce or a county supervisor, or some person or organization of that character.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is that all the requirement?

Mr. LEVER. And in addition to that it must likewise be requested by the agricultural college or experiment station of the State.

Mr. TREADWAY. I want to state, Mr. Chairman, that since my first inquiry there has been handed me one of the bulletins issued under the surveys of a county in Missouri, and I take it that is a fair sample of the style of bulletin generally issued by the department. It is evidently very complete and must be extremely useful to the community directly affected.

Mr. SNELL. Is it not necessary for the State and local communities to do something in these surveys also?

Mr. LEVER. There is no law that requires that the State shall put up a proportionate part of the expense, but there is a rule of the department which really requires it.

Mr. SNELL. I wish to say that I took this up with the department at the request of some people in order to get a soil survey made, and they replied to me, as I remember, that certain things must be done in connection with the agricultural department of my State before that could be granted.

Mr. LEVER. That is true. And the department, except when it is going into a State that has had no survey at all, as an educational proposition, does require the State or community to put up a part of the fund.

Mr. SNELL. And after they have made the original survey they go on and complete it and make the maps?

Mr. LEVER. They make the maps and do the printing.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and demonstration within the United States to determine the best method of obtaining potash on a commercial scale, \$127,000: *Provided*, That the product obtained from such experimentation may be sold at a price to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, and the amount obtained from the sale thereof shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, though the paragraph is subject to a point of order, I hope the gentleman will not make it, because while I very greatly regret the way these moneys have been spent, I think the committee has in good faith appropriated, and we can not well at this stage of the game discontinue that kelp mill out on the Pacific coast. I suppose it is necessary we should waste a little more money out there. Probably we ought to complete it and let it run for a while if for nothing more than to demonstrate how unwisely the appropriation was made.

Mr. SNELL. Do I understand the Government owns the kelp mill out there?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is correct, if that is his understanding. We have a kelp mill, and we are proposing to finish it and complete it and spend \$127,000 to make, if all our hopes and expectations blossom into reality, 5 tons of potash per day. Of course there are a great many "ifs" and "ands" and "buts" and "whys" and "wherefores" along the trail between now and the accomplishment of that hope. But I think we will have to make this appropriation. I do not see how we can get out of it at this stage. I do not want to have what I said in regard to these two items taken as severely reflecting on the Committee on Agriculture, because I realize that with the shortage in potash, the demand for it, the necessity for having it, the committee feels under compulsion to do all that it can to encourage potash development. The trouble is the department has not used these appropriations as it was expected they would use them. They have used a large part of the appropriation for investigation, perfectly idle, in a domain clear outside of the department's proper scope or activities, and are here going into a manufacturing industry out of which nothing worth while has or will come.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ascertain the extent to which present law has been changed by the proviso incorporated in this paragraph. If my memory serves me right, under prior legislation we authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to sell the product of this mill.

Mr. LEVER. At the market price.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is purposed by authorizing the sale at any price that may be determined by him? Is it to sell below the market price? Will the product that is expected to be manufactured at this experiment station or experimental mill be of such a low grade that it will be necessary to sell it below the market price?

Mr. LEVER. No. Allow me to read the testimony.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to say, as the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has said, that the committee is at a great disadvantage in the consideration of this bill in not having the hearings indexed so that we can examine them ourselves, and we are subjected to the necessity of making many of these inquiries which I believe should be made before the matter is finally passed.

Mr. LEVER. I appreciate that, and therefore I think the gentleman will agree that I have been very liberal in the discussion.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is always liberal.

Mr. LEVER. We asked Mr. Harrison at our hearing for the reason for the change of this language, and his answer was:

Mr. HARRISON. As I understand it, the reason for changing the language was, in the first place, that the Secretary thought the department ought to have the authority to fix the price in the light of conditions existing at the time of the sale. The plant, of course, was not established for the purpose of making a profit. If we work out important processes and reduce the cost of production, there does not seem to be any real reason why the Federal Government should charge enormous prices simply because other companies engaged in the business may be doing so.

Then Mr. Brown, who is in charge of this work, made practically the same explanation of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the phraseology, if the gentleman will permit, is not limited to the cost of manufacture. He may sell below the market price, and sell below the cost of manufacture. There is no sense in that from the governmental standpoint.

The Government has gone far enough into the Treasury for this experimental purpose without making a still further loss by selling below the cost of manufacture.

Mr. LEVER. Of course, I do not think they would do it, but that might be cured by providing that the product is not to be sold below the cost of manufacture.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. If the gentleman will recall, it was stated that in case the war should end and the price of potash should fall, the department might have on hand a large quantity of potash that had cost a certain amount to produce, and it could not sell it at all.

Mr. LEVER. That is true, of course. I had overlooked that fact.

Mr. STAFFORD. They could sell it under the law at the market price. Under this provision they can give it away or sell it at less than the cost of manufacture. They could go into the market where a private manufacturer is obtaining only a nominal profit and undersell him, and undersell him at a price which is less than the cost of manufacture by the Government.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. If we are making only 5 tons a day, as I understood to be the fact from the statement of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], I do not see how it would have any material effect on the market one way or the other.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not follow the gentleman's statement closely as to whether or not that is the capacity of this experimental mill, but I question the advisability of this language being carried in this bill without qualification.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that I have absolutely no objection to inserting the old language. Probably it would be a wise thing to do.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the existing law, the Secretary of Agriculture has that authority now?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order as to the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina wish to speak on the point of order?

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. I understood the gentleman to make the point of order only as to the proviso.

Mr. STAFFORD. Only as to the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The proviso is stricken out on a point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations and demonstrations in bee culture, \$35,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I simply desire to get a little explanation of this item. I have forgotten the construction that has been given to the word "demonstration" in this bill. Will this permit some of the agents to go out and make demonstrations as to the proper manner of handling bees and increasing the production of honey?

Mr. LEVER. It will.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What was the amount of this item last year?

Mr. LEVER. Twenty thousand dollars.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I thought it was increased, and I think very properly so.

Mr. LEVER. We have increased it \$15,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. One of the officials in the Department of Entomology told me that it was a conservative estimate that \$25,000,000 worth of honey was lost every year which might, if proper means were taken, be saved through the bees. At this time, when there is such a shortage of sugar, the item, it seems to me, is very important, and I am glad that the committee has raised the allowance.

Mr. LEVER. It was on that theory that the committee made the raise.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting tropical and subtropical fruits, including insects affecting the orange, lemon, grapefruit, mango, etc., \$16,500.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas offers the following amendment at the bottom of the paragraph on page 55.
"For investigation and control of the grasshopper as a destructive agent in grain and grass fields and gardens, \$20,000."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto shall close in seven minutes, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CONNELLY] to have five.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in seven minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, can not the gentleman make it 12 minutes?

Mr. LEVER. I will make it 12. The gentleman is a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina modifies his request and asks that the debate be closed in 12 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I may be able to convince the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, as well as the other gentlemen of that committee and the House, of the merits of this amendment that I have just offered. It is possible that I should have sought the committee before the bill was completed and brought on the floor and there made my plea for this item. But I understand that it can be very properly offered at this place and time.

I find that the bill provides—and very properly so—for the investigation of insects of almost every other kind that destroy grain and vegetables that are raised upon the farms of the country. The man who should be encouraged to go to his limit at this time is the farmer. He is the man who has great responsibilities resting upon him, and he should have every encouragement that can be given. Those of you who know the adversities that must be met and overcome by the farmer know how important it is that after his crop has been produced, after he has gone out and plowed and planted and cultivated, that he should not then find his hopes dashed to the ground and his season's labor lost by the visitation of some pest that he is helpless to combat.

The grasshopper, in many sections of the country, is the pest that blights the hopes of the farmer and robs him of his crop just at a time when it promises most. A great many of the States have given the matter of the control of the grasshopper some attention, but no State has the equipment for investigation along the lines provided for in this section of the bill that is possessed by the Agricultural Department with its well organized corps of specialists, scientists, and naturalists. The States are necessarily prevented by the expense involved from the doing of many things that can be more properly, efficiently, and economically done here. I realize that the control of the other insects mentioned in the bill is a matter of importance, and I hope the committee will adopt this amendment, which merely gives the farmer who is fighting the grasshopper—which is one of the oldest and greatest pests known—the same assistance that it does the other farmers who are having their crops devastated by insects.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. For a question; yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why would not the authority as carried in the paragraph on page 55, lines 8 to 10, "For investigation of insects affecting cereal and forage crops, including special investigation of the Hessian fly and chinch bug, \$122,060," be available for the purpose of investigating the effects of the grasshopper on the wheat fields of Kansas?

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. The department, as I understand it, does not so consider it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; but the language is broad enough to enable the department to make the investigation cover grasshoppers, if they wish to do so.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. But the appropriation provided there will be used up under the other headings.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give the information that there is no available balance of that large appropriation of \$122,060?

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. I am not sure about that. I would not like to state that that is true without more information. Mr. Chairman, I wish that Members might understand the importance of this amendment, and how the farmers on the western prairie lands are affected when thousands of acres of crops are destroyed overnight by grasshoppers. You gentlemen

who are informed on the subject know that in one day thousands of acres are destroyed, when the crop is just coming into harvest.

Mr. KINKAID. Would it not accomplish the intention of the gentleman to have inserted in line 9, page 55, the word "grasshoppers," so that they will be included with the Hessian fly and the chinch bug, in accordance with the suggestion made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]?

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. In answer to that, I would be satisfied if I could have the assurance of the chairman of the committee and the other members of the committee that the appropriation would justify the expenditure of \$20,000 for this purpose.

Mr. KINKAID. I suggest that amendment as a substitute for the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. If the gentleman will agree to it and the committee will agree to it, that will be satisfactory to me. I hope they will, because I assure the gentleman that it is very important to a number of States.

Mr. KINKAID. I will not take up any more of the gentleman's time.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I hope that gentlemen in the committee will not see fit to oppose this item. Personally I know that it is very essential. I wish I had the data at hand to convince gentlemen here of the meritorious character of this proposition.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. I will.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have an impression that some years ago the Department of Agriculture made a very thorough investigation of the grasshopper, of its habits and habitat, and the character of the destructive work that it does. It is very well understood. I doubt very much if anything would be developed from another investigation which would be helpful. I understand the means of combatting the grasshopper are pretty well understood now.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Let me suggest to the gentleman that the old migratory grasshopper has been pretty well put out of business; but the grasshopper that now does the injury to the fields of the Central West is the local or nonmigratory grasshopper. The habits of this grasshopper, the manner of its reproduction, the manner of the laying of the eggs, and so on, have been studied by the States, but the States have never done it as thoroughly as could be done by the scientists in the Bureau of Entomology.

Mr. ANDERSON. Has the gentleman ever submitted his proposition to the Bureau of Entomology of the Department of Agriculture to ascertain whether they are conducting this investigation now, or whether there is likely to be anything of value learned by an investigation?

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. No; I have never submitted it personally, but I have known of the work in the last year by the State. For instance, the university in my State sent its young men to the western part of the State to make observations and study this very destructive agency. It is a matter of very great importance to the people in a large section of the country, and I hope gentlemen will not oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOOLITTLE] if he desires recognition.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman who reserved the point of order against the amendment of my colleague will not insist upon it. It may be difficult for Members of the House to understand exactly what damage can be consummated by grasshoppers when they appear in the numbers that, I am sorry to say, they sometimes do appear in the western part of our State and in a great many other Western States. It may be interesting to the committee to know that there is a statute on the books of Kansas which makes it incumbent upon every able-bodied man to respond to the call of the township trustee when he orders them out to fight migratory grasshoppers. In the last few years we have been fortunate, as my colleague Mr. CONNELLY said, in getting rid of the migratory grasshoppers to a large degree; but when the country is visited by a drought like that we had in 1913, which, of course, is liable to happen at any time, the grasshoppers come out of the pastures down into the valleys where the vegetation is green and succulent, and they destroy that vegetation in the course of a few hours. They eat the leaves off of the growing corn. They even eat the leaves off the trees. If we can do anything to help eradicate this pest, it is the duty of the Government to do so, especially in this time of the demand for the production of more food; and this amount should be made available specifically for the purpose of destroying grasshoppers.

Mr. COX. Has the Government ever undertaken this before?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Not that I know of.

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman think it would be just as fair for the Government to undertake this investigation as it is to undertake the investigation of the boll weevil?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I think so.

Mr. COX. I think so, too.

Mr. TILSON. Is it the gentleman's idea that the Government should take its soldiers or other able-bodied men, to join the able-bodied men provided for in the Kansas statute, and go out to combat this grasshopper? I thought this appropriation was simply for investigation. It seems to me from the knowledge of the grasshopper shown by the gentleman himself, his colleague, and others here on the floor, that we already know the problem, and that the real question is how to meet and solve the problem of eradication, which does not seem to be covered by the gentleman's amendment at all. The appropriation here is simply for investigation.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I believe my friend will agree with me that we have more strenuous necessity for soldiers across the water.

Mr. TILSON. That is what I thought.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I realize that my friend made the suggestion about the soldiers in good humor. I want to say that I cited the statute, which is more or less obsolete at this time, but, nevertheless, it is on the books and shows the importance in the State of Kansas utilizing or making a determined fight against the grasshopper.

Mr. TILSON. My question was whether the amendment was to make a fight against the grasshopper or an investigation that would enable the people of Kansas to make the fight.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. If the amendment is not broad enough—and I do not remember the exact wording of it—it ought to be amended so that demonstration work can be done. I think that was the intention of the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. I will suggest that the amendment was drawn following the language in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Here we have an item to which I direct attention, providing, in lines 8 to 10, page 55, for investigation of insects affecting cereal and forage crops, \$122,000, and the following item for the investigation of insects affecting southern field crops, \$89,000. Those appropriations can be utilized for the same purpose for investigating grasshoppers that infest the wheat fields.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. We want a specific suggestion and direction from Congress undertaking the elimination of the grasshopper.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Congress and the committee is recommending a very large amount, over \$200,000 that can be utilized for the very purpose which the amendment proposes. It is unnecessary. You should be modest in your efforts after appropriations when Congress has already made them. I assume that \$200,000 is large enough to investigate this old trouble of the grasshopper.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. It would be if the grasshopper could be investigated under that appropriation, but it is claimed that it is not available, and I do not think it is.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Was the point of order reserved on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It was; and the committee by unanimous consent limited the debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto to 12 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. But I assume, Mr. Chairman, that the committee can not, by unanimous consent, limit debate on a point of order. That is in the discretion of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The discussion was limited on the merits, the discussion on the point of order is for the Chair. The Chair can stop the discussion of the point of order at any time.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Wisconsin is going to press the point of order, I will not take the remaining two minutes' time.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not think it is necessary to insert another paragraph already covered by the new paragraphs in the bill. I think the point of order should be made.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will indulge me for the two minutes to which I am entitled, I will say that I am reading from the program of work of the Department of Agriculture. Among other things, it says:

Extensive investigation on the grasshopper has been conducted and positive methods of control secured. The results of this investigation are summarized in an article published in the Yearbook of the depart-

ment for the year 1915. The saving of money to the agricultural interests as the result of this investigation will undoubtedly be immense. A farmers' bulletin giving full direction for the application of the methods of destroying the grasshoppers is in course of preparation.

So that all of this whole matter has been investigated by the department and the methods have been worked out for the control of this pest. These methods have been published for those interested in the proposition. So that it seems to me that this is one of the lines of work the department has completed, and I hope that we will not put ourselves in a position of starting it over again.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is a sufficient warrant, Mr. Chairman, for pressing the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment provides for an investigation and control of the grasshopper. The Chair is of the opinion that it is perfectly competent to offer an amendment to the bill providing for an investigation, but the Chair is further of the opinion that the amendment goes beyond that when it provides for control. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations, identification, and systematic classification of miscellaneous insects, including the study of insects affecting the health of man and domestic animals, household insects, and the importation and exchange of useful insects, \$52,330.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, is this the proper item for the consideration of the question of the eradication of mosquitoes?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I am inclined to think, if you are going to consider the mosquito at all, it will come under this item.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman state whether there is any investigation going on on the part of the Government as to the eradication, elimination or control of this universal pest?

Mr. LEVER. Yes, there is; the Department of Agriculture under this item has been conducting investigations in reference to the mosquito, especially on the effect of the mosquito upon farm operations in certain localities. For example, they have selected a community, say, in Mississippi, and they are investigating the habits of the mosquito there and of the effect it has upon agriculture. In that respect it differs from the work of the Public Health Service.

Mr. TILSON. The paragraph says "including the study of insects affecting the health of man and domestic animals." Of course it has been conclusively proven that the mosquito does injure the health of man, besides being a very provoking pest.

Mr. LEVER. The committee has been fearful for some years that there might be a conflict of authority or a duplication of work under this item with the work of the Public Health Service. I have tried to see that no such duplication takes place. The line of work already done by the department under this item is confined to its effect on the agricultural situation in the community.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general administrative expenses connected with above lines of investigation, and for miscellaneous expenses incident thereto, \$9,000.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. Is it not a fact that the Government has succeeded remarkably well in exterminating the mosquito on the Panama Canal Zone?

Mr. LEVER. I think one of the greatest accomplishments of the Government on the zone was the extermination of the mosquito.

Mr. KINKAID. That was the understanding when I tarried there some six or seven days six or eight years ago. I was not annoyed with a single mosquito. I failed to see a mosquito. I crossed the zone every day from one side to the other by rail, stopping here and there, observing the developments that were going on in the construction of the canal. We had mosquito nets over our beds at the hotel at night, but I heard not a mosquito humming around. The means employed there were wonderfully successful, I am sure. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the enforcement of sections 241, 242, 243, and 244 of the act approved March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," and for the enforcement of section 1 of the act approved May 25, 1900, entitled "An act to enlarge the powers of the Department of Agriculture, prohibit the transportation by interstate commerce of game killed in violation of local laws, and for other purposes," including all necessary investigations in connection therewith, \$22,000.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question. I presume this is the same amount carried in the appropriation heretofore that has been expended for the enforcement of these sections?

Mr. LEVER. Exactly.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Has anyone in the Biological Survey Bureau undertaken to give the committee an itemized account of the expenditure of this money?

Mr. LEVER. We have the data. That is provided for in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, which is filed each year with Congress, giving the details of the expenditures of the department.

Mr. KINCHELOE. My purpose in asking the chairman this question is that I have information from people who ought to know that not all of this appropriation in the years gone by has been expended for this purpose, but has been expended in other branches, probably, of the Biological Survey and not for the purpose solely of enforcing these sections of the statute.

Mr. LEVER. I have before me the details of the expenditures, and I shall read some of them:

Salaries: Assistant, \$3,250; assistant, \$2,500; assistant, \$1,600; inspector, \$1,800; four inspectors, \$1,500; collaborators and inspectors, \$600 to \$1,200 each, doing part time; traveling expenses, \$8,000; equipment and material, \$500; miscellaneous items, \$300.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The only question I had in mind was whether or not these gentlemen who are employed there to enforce these sections exercised all their energies in the enforcement of them?

Mr. LEVER. I can not say about that. I hope they do. If the gentleman has any information to the effect that they do not, I would like to have it.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including experiments and demonstrations in destroying wolves, coyotes, prairie dogs, and other animals injurious to agriculture and animal husbandry, and for investigations and experiments in connection with rearing of fur-bearing animals, including mink and marten, \$394,820: *Provided*, That of this sum \$15,000 shall be used for the destruction of ground squirrels on the national forests and other public lands: *And provided also*, That of this sum not less than \$125,000 shall be used on the national forests and the public domain in destroying wolves, coyotes, and other animals injurious to agriculture, animal husbandry, and wild game: *And provided further*, That of this sum not more than \$125,000 shall be used on the public lands, national forests, and elsewhere in the Western and Northwestern States for the protection of stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies by the destruction of wolves, coyotes, and other predatory wild animals.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 59, at the end of line 25, insert:
"Provided further, That of this sum \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used for the purpose of investigating the extent and effect of the killing and harassing by dogs of sheep and other meat-producing animals, and of the best methods for reducing and preventing the same."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that and ask unanimous consent that debate upon the amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] to have five minutes, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] three, and reserving two minutes for myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate upon the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming and all amendments thereto shall close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, one of the most serious shortages in the world food and material supply at this time is the shortage of mutton and wool. The number of sheep in the United States has been steadily decreasing since 1911. There were 53,000,000 at that time, 49,000,000 in 1914, and 46,000,000 in 1917. Our wool production has decreased in like degree. Those who have investigated the questions leading to the reduction of the number of sheep in the country have come to the conclusion that one of the potent influences in the reduction of the flocks and against the increase and extension of the flocks is the depredations of predatory sheep-killing dogs, just common, mangy curs.

Mr. COX. And old hounds.

Mr. MONDELL. And old hounds; of no value to anybody, living upon the substance of the world, wandering about over the country and making it utterly impossible in widely scattered and very extensive sections of the country to keep a flock of sheep with any safety or certainty. A sheep-killing dog not only kills for the purpose of food but after he has become accustomed and habited to that sort of thing takes it up as a pastime, and one sheep-killing dog will destroy an entire flock in a few hours.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman outline briefly how it is proposed this money shall be expended for this very worthy object?

Mr. MONDELL. My hope is—and I want to say to the chairman of the committee that I think \$5,000 would do—that the department will gather all the information obtainable with regard to the situation in the various States of the Union, where the depredations of the sheep-killing dog have had the greatest effect in keeping down the flock, to learn the effect of State laws and to suggest possible remedies, legal and otherwise. I have in mind a remedy. I expect to propose it in a short time in the form of a bill, and I have at least one Member of the House who is pledged to support it, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Provided you get your tax high enough.

Mr. MONDELL. You can make the tax as high as you like.

Mr. COX. I would not make it less than \$50.

Mr. MONDELL. I shall propose a Federal tax upon dogs as a war measure, absolutely essential at this time to increase the wool needed for the uniforms for our boys, and to increase the food supply, and as a measure that will be as beneficial in peace as in war.

If we can reduce the sheep-killing dogs in the country by one-half we can double the number of sheep in the Union to the very great advantage and benefit of everybody. In 1915 the Department of Agriculture published bulletin 652, by V. O. McWhorter, on the sheep-killing dog. Let me quote briefly from it:

DOGS THE MAIN CAUSE OF DECREASE IN THE NUMBER OF SHEEP.

Sheep-killing dogs are not only recognized as the worst enemy of eastern flockmasters at the present time but are known to be the principal cause of so marked a decrease in the number of sheep kept on farms. The moral effect upon all persons who have seen sheep killed, injured, or frightened by dogs is far more destructive to the industry than the actual damage sustained. No farmer contemplating the raising of sheep is likely to venture on the enterprise while the flocks of his neighbors are continually meeting reverses through the attacks of dogs, as the ultimate financial losses following such reverses are incalculable. Dog depredations to flocks are not only disheartening and discouraging to the flockmaster but they also break up breeding plans and render flocks restless and nonproductive.

Sheep-killing dogs work both singly and in groups, but usually in two or three. They do not limit their attacks to the flocks of the immediate vicinity in which they are kept, but travel for miles in all directions, spreading destruction in the flocks with which they come in contact. Because their work is so often done under the cover of darkness, it is almost impossible to catch them in the act of worrying the sheep, and hence they can seldom be positively identified.

The ways in which different dogs attack and destroy sheep vary greatly. Some dogs simply kill one or two sheep in a flock, while others continue the attack until all the sheep are either destroyed or crippled. In many cases, where large numbers are killed, they are neither bitten nor wounded, but simply chased until they die from exhaustion.

After a dog has once formed the habit of killing sheep it seemingly becomes a mania with him, and he is seldom, if ever, broken of it. He not only destroys sheep himself but leads other dogs to the work. No consideration should be given such dogs; if additional losses to flocks from this source are to be avoided, they should be dispatched as soon as their habits are known.

That dogs are a real hindrance to the sheep industry is not only acclaimed by the testimony of thousands of sheep owners whose flocks have suffered through ravages by them, but is verified by figures showing a conservative estimate of the partial loss incurred by flockowners during the year 1913. The figures were compiled from the reports of county treasurers of different States, giving the number of sheep killed by dogs and paid for by the several counties during the year. Not all counties or States reported these losses, as in many cases no law existed which empowered the county to pay for sheep killed; for this reason it was necessary to compute the total loss on a percentage basis.

Through a summary of the replies received from crop correspondents in the 36 farm States regarding sheep, it is estimated that the present number of sheep in these States can be increased by 150 per cent without displacing other live stock on farms. This summary, given in detail in Table II, also shows that sheep raising is considered profitable by a majority of the correspondents in most of the States, and that dogs are the main barrier to keeping them.

TABLE II.—Summary of replies from crop correspondents showing estimated possible increase in number of sheep on farms without displacing other stock and causes preventing such increase.

State.	Is sheep raising profitable?		Average estimated possible increase in number of sheep.	Causes preventing increase.	
	Yes.	No.		Dogs.	Other causes.
			Per cent.		
Alabama.....	7	23	100.3	15	3
Arkansas.....	25	17	117.2	15	3
Connecticut.....	3	2	377.0	3	2
Delaware.....	2	1	80.0	2	1
Florida.....	14	5	192.7	8	1
Georgia.....	22	41	128.2	36	9
Illinois.....	43	28	90.3	17	23
Indiana.....	42	21	77.6	28	22
Iowa.....	47	11	125.4	12	22
Kansas.....	35	22	196.0	6	20

TABLE II.—Summary of replies from crop correspondents showing estimated possible increase in number of sheep on farms, etc.—Contd.

State.	Is sheep raising profitable?		Average estimated possible increase in number of sheep.	Causes preventing increase.	
	Yes.	No.		Dogs.	Other causes.
Kentucky	46	21	139	49	7
Louisiana	19	11	175.0	30	5
Maine	8	6	160.0	10	5
Maryland	11	3	67.3	7	2
Massachusetts	3	6	125.0	5	2
Michigan	25	15	122.4	1	13
Minnesota	32	20	129.2	5	21
Mississippi	31	22	118.0	30	4
Missouri	62	15	141.4	30	23
Nebraska	2	15	54.8	4	13
New Hampshire	3	7	367.0	4	1
New Jersey	3	7	175.1	3	2
New York	27	16	68.8	17	16
North Carolina	27	35	116.1	28	7
North Dakota	22	8	201.9	10	10
Ohio	30	20	39.9	29	33
Oklahoma	10	14	285.9	7	1
Pennsylvania	11	16	111.7	14	17
Rh. de Island	2	22	270.0	1	1
South Carolina	3	22	138.1	11	1
South Dakota	20	5	111.1	3	12
Tennessee	50	13	153.5	15	5
Vermont	4	5	181.0	5	3
Virginia	63	16	127.3	19	17
West Virginia	35	5	88.7	22	9
Wisconsin	26	18	80.5	1	21
Total	187	124	151.8	531	363

An increase of 150 per cent in the sheep of the States not included in the western division would increase the total number of sheep in this country by approximately 33,681,000 head. As computed from the average farm price per head of sheep in the sections considered for the year 1914, such an increase in number would bring about a corresponding increase in value of \$144,267,000. It is believed by some who have made a study of the question that an increase of even 500 per cent need not seriously interfere with the keeping of other live stock now on farms.

I also desire to present the views expressed on the subject by the Wyoming Woolgrowers' Association in recent convention, as follows:

Whereas for many years the loss of sheep, calves, and other live stock from the depredations of dogs and predatory wild animals has resulted in great loss in production of food and clothing of this Nation; and

Whereas there now exists in several of the Western States a dangerous disease known as "rabies," affecting the coyote and resulting in menace to both man and beast; and

Whereas, as the presence of the sheep-killing dogs in certain portions of the United States menaces the sheep industry to such an extent as to make the successful raising and breeding of sheep impossible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we hereby petition Congress to levy a tax upon all dogs in the United States, and out of the fund thereby created such portion as may be necessary shall be used to exterminate the stock-killing dog, the predatory wild animals, and the range-destroying rodent.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet I desire to present, as relating to various items of this bill, the resolutions adopted by the Wyoming Woolgrowers' Association at a meeting of that association held in Douglas, Wyo., January 9 to 11, as follows:

[Resolutions adopted by the Wyoming Woolgrowers' Association in fourteenth annual convention assembled, Douglas, Wyo., Jan. 9, 10, and 11, 1918.]

Whereas our country has been forced into the world's war by the lawless terrorism and inhuman brutality of the German Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the fourteenth annual convention of the Wyoming Woolgrowers' Association, in convention assembled, send greetings to our President and pledge to the President of our United States our undivided and earnest support to any and all efforts that he may make to win the war.

Whereas it is to the interest of the American people that legislation should be adopted which would prevent the misrepresentation of adulterated products of wool: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we respectfully urge the adoption of legislation by Congress that would result in the enactment of a suitable "pure-fabric" law.

We demand that no shoddy or other adulterants shall be mixed with wool that is to be made into soldier garments and that our soldiers shall be as well or better dressed than the soldiers of any other country.

Whereas the Biological Survey has been doing very creditable work in destroying predatory wild animals and the range-destroying rodents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we petition Congress for an appropriation of \$500,000 for immediate use by the Biological Survey for the extermination of the aforesaid animals.

Resolved by the wool growers of Wyoming in convention assembled, at Douglas, Wyo., January 10, 1918, That the woolgrowers of Wyoming are in accord with the spirit and general plans of the Government in establishing values of industrial and commercial production, with direct and economic distribution; and be it further

Resolved, That, in cooperation with such proposed undertaking, the wool growers of Wyoming suggest that the wool clip of 1918 produced in the western range country be concentrated at logical distributing points adjacent to or near sources of production.

That National Wool Growers' Association be licensed and authorized by the Government to act as selling and distributing agents, to be empowered to make cash advances to wool growers on f5-fr shipments through sight drafts attached to railroad bills of lading at the open-market cost of money pending examination of wool, and fixing values upon present range of open-market prices or upon such other basis calculated to increase profitable production, such action to be made by committee of equal representation by the Government, the manufacturers, and the wool growers.

After wools have been concentrated and worked into commercial grades, the Government representatives to take over for account of the Government such grades and amounts suitable for military requirements, the remaining wool to be sold, either at public auction or by allotment, to manufacturers for their actual milling requirements, in proportion to available supply in charge of the aforesaid authorized committee.

Whereas the production of wool and meat is very necessary to clothe and feed our soldiers; and

Whereas skilled labor is necessary in this production: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the Provost Marshal General to place the skilled labor employed in the production of live stock in class 3 under deferred classification plan of the selective-draft law.

Whereas western flockmasters are as desirous as any other class of citizens of having the West developed and its lands put to their proper use; and

Whereas it is necessary for the economical handling of live stock on the Government lands of the United States to have defined and established trails from the desert or winter grazing lands to the forest reserves and from the forest reserves to railway shipping points; and Whereas Congress has passed a law for said purpose: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Wyoming Woolgrowers' Association, respectfully urge the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation by agent or otherwise with the various live-stock associations, under the provisions of this law, to cause to be set aside such unoccupied strips of Government land as will be consistent with the economical moving of live stock to and from such ranges: And be it further

Resolved, That said association is in favor of such national land regulation as shall have for its object the proper, sane, and beneficial development of the public lands within the State of Wyoming after full consideration of all the varied interests involved.

Whereas we recognize the value of grazing privileges upon the forest reserves, and we commend the forestry department for the building and improvement of highways and in the destruction of predatory animals; and

Whereas the activities of the National Wool Warehouse & Storage Co., both in its live-stock educational work and in the marketing of wool consigned to it, has resulted in pecuniary benefit to the flockmasters: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wyoming Woolgrowers' Association favors and recommends the support by the Wyoming flockmasters of the varied activities of the National Wool Warehouse & Storage Co., so that this selling agency of the sheepmen may become a controlling factor in the marketing of wool.

Whereas the University of Wyoming, through its agricultural college and experiment station, is primarily interested in serving the agricultural interests of the State, thus aiding its best development; and Whereas there are at present no authoritative channels through which the officers of the university and its college of agriculture and experiment station may seek advice and obtain direct knowledge in the various agricultural lines; and

Whereas the Wyoming Woolgrowers' Association, representing one of the major agricultural industries of the State, has no authority of advisory character or otherwise to shape the direction of teaching, demonstration, and research of said college and station along the lines in which said association may be interested; and

Whereas, believing that the best results may be obtained only by legislative enactment of laws recognizing the right of the various State industries to have a voice in the work which is being done by the agricultural college and experiment station of said university: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wyoming Woolgrowers' Association favors the enactment of laws by the legislature authorizing the appointment of committees from the various agricultural and stock interests of the State, these committees to cooperate with the agricultural college and experiment station in the planning and carrying through of investigational work.

Whereas experience has shown that the removal of an import duty on wool and live-stock products failed to lower the selling price thereof; and

Whereas the removal of duty from live-stock products, and especially wool, deprived the National Government of millions of revenue which would otherwise have been received: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wyoming Woolgrowers' Association does hereby petition Congress to amend the existing tariff laws so that revenue can be produced for the Government from the imports of wool, live stock, and other animal products to such an extent as the necessities of the country may require.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the questions that has been agitating Ohio for a great many months. I referred yesterday to the fact that one of the large sheep raisers in my section of the State, which by the way is a sheep-growing State, growing a fine brand of sheep, came to see me during the hol-

days, during our vacation, and made the statement that three times this year already his fine flock of sheep has been torn up by the dogs. He said that it is not only the loss to him, but it so disintegrates the flock that the sheep amount to very little after one of these raids is made, and he told me that it appears that the dogs go in packs like wolves, and when once they break into a flock of sheep the sheep for that year are fairly ruined. Now, I hardly see any justification on the part of a legislative body not to do something to prevent this wicked destruction of a very useful source of our meat supply, as well as our clothing supply, and it requires a very drastic remedy in order to meet this situation. I have thought that perhaps the Government could not supply the remedy, but that we would have to move upon the State legislatures, and I so spoke to him. It has been suggested here that we can reach it in the form of taxation. I think all of us would realize there is one item in taxation that would be inequitable, and that is these dog fanciers, who have great wealth, and who would be very willing to pay any tax that might be levied upon them to keep their dogs, would not desist from the keeping of dogs simply because you have required a heavy tax. I thought that one of the things with which we could reach it would be to make the dog an outlaw, and as soon as he goes off the farm to which he belongs, or off the yard to which he belongs, that he be subject to destruction by anyone injured without any basis for damages to be paid by the man who kills him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FESS. I hope if the way is clear that Congress may do something to speed up the States in their duty.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. I recognize, of course, that the sheep industry suffers greatly on account of worthless dogs. Some gentleman made the statement the other day that there are two things which are militating against sheep raising in this country. One is a parasite and the other is the dog, and whoever made the statement spoke with authority. But I do not feel that this is the way to get at this problem. I should much rather—

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I have only two minutes. I would much rather consider the suggestion of the gentleman from Wyoming as to putting a tax upon dogs.

Mr. MONDELL. Let us get a little information from the department to help along.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think there is any need for the information. I think any man who knows anything about the sheep industry of the country at all has pretty accurate and pretty full information as to the depredations of the dog upon sheep, and the information that you would develop would probably not be of very much value to the country. If Congress is prepared to act, it has the necessary information. I feel as my friend from Ohio [Mr. Fess] does, that this is naturally a State and not a national proposition. The same gentleman who told about the parasites and dogs also said that he had made it his business to confer with a great many members of the State legislatures, especially in the South, and he found them all enthusiastically in favor of handling the dog problem very drastically if Congress would, but the State legislatures were not willing to tackle the problem because it becomes a very vital political thing when it interferes with man's best friend, his dog. But be that as it may, I do not feel that the expenditure here proposed would bring to the Government a commensurate return, and I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Does the gentleman withdraw the point of order?

Mr. LEVER. I do not think it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas seemed to have it.

Upon a division (demanded by Mr. MONDELL) there were—yeas 21, yeas 16.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I am bound to ask for tellers on that.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Can the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture furnish any statement as to the amount of the expenditure last year for the destruction of coyotes and the number of animals destroyed?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the amount carried in this bill is exactly the same amount as that carried in the present year's appropriation bill. We had information before the committee as to the number of animals destroyed by prairie dogs, coyotes, wolves, bear, and the

like. For instance, I find here there was destroyed 11,000 gray wolves, something like 53,000 predatory wild animals of all descriptions, and that they turned into the Treasury from the skins of the animals killed something like \$55,000 during last year. We did have a rather full explanation of this item, but as to just how many coyotes were killed I do not remember.

Mr. WALSH. But the committee was satisfied that this work was not only beneficial but that the Government was reimbursed to some extent on account of the expenditure that was made?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. The statement was made before the committee, which was startling to me—how accurate it is I do not know—that there was a yearly loss from the prairie dog of \$250,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. That is not the coyote?

Mr. LEVER. That is not the coyote; no.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for enforcing the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. L., 847, 848), relating to the protection of migratory game and insectivorous birds, and for cooperation with local authorities in the protection of migratory birds, and for necessary investigations connected therewith, \$50,000.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I just want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Has the Supreme Court decided those appeals yet?

Mr. LEVER. I do not think that it has.

Mr. COX. As I recall it, they at least had a hearing on it and postponed it for further argument.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman's recollection is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I was looking for that paragraph in the bill which the Clerk has just been reading and in which an appropriation was made covering the subject of migratory birds.

Mr. LEVER. The Clerk has just read it. It is on page 60, lines 4 to 11, inclusive.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], if, in view of the fact that a special act is now being considered, and an appropriation carried in the act covering the subject of migratory birds, it is not advisable that this should be eliminated?

Mr. LEVER. I think not, for the reason—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Of course, the section by which this appropriation is being made is to be repealed by this new act.

Mr. LEVER. I appreciate that.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I inquire if the gentleman would be inclined to make a point of order if we inserted that proposed act right in here in lieu of this paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. That act, as I understand it, is an enabling act, involving the treaty between this country and Canada, and as a protection to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I would feel compelled to make a point of order.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am assured, would be agreeable to inserting that.

Mr. LEVER. Not having conferred with the members of the committee, I feel I would be doing them an injustice by allowing it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I inquire of the gentleman from South Carolina if he has acquainted himself with the provisions of the proposed act?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that I have been so very busy that I have not. I have read about it in the newspapers, and that is about all.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is it true that the act cited here, approved March 4, 1913, has been efficacious in accomplishing the object and intent Congress had when it passed it?

Mr. LEVER. The statement was made before the committee that there has been a very large increase in the number of waterfowl in this country, due to the stoppage of spring shooting, and that the act was efficacious in the direction of the purposes sought to be accomplished by it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That is, it was moving in the right direction?

Mr. LEVER. Moving in the right direction; yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Has the gentleman any information before his committee to the effect that the act ought to be amended if the real object Congress had is to be accomplished?

Mr. LEVER. While we have no recent testimony to that effect, I think some suggestions for amendment have been made. Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Did the gentleman's committee have any hearing on this particular paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That is, representatives of the Department of Agriculture appeared and gave information relative to it?

Mr. LEVER. We had a representative of the Biological Survey before the committee and examined him on every item in the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Did he or did he not recommend a change in that law?

Mr. LEVER. No; not in the hearings on this particular bill. If he did, it escapes my recollection at this moment.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Have we appropriated \$50,000 each year since 1913 for this purpose?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That is, we have used up \$250,000, then?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. I think it is only fair to say that the appropriation is smaller in comparison to the work that could be accomplished, even under the present act.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Has the gentleman's committee been informed of any difficulties experienced in attempting to enforce this by certain States and certain jurisdictions refusing to comply with the terms of this law?

Mr. LEVER. I do not recall any such statement before the committee this year. I seem to have a recollection that there was some difficulty a few years ago. I think the general sentiment of the people is becoming more and more favorable to this kind of legislation and this act.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I think that statement is entirely correct. But, as a matter of fact, is not the gentleman aware that certain amendments to this law are necessary if it is really to be effective?

Mr. LEVER. Not speaking for the committee at all, because the membership of my committee is divided on this proposition, but for myself only, I answer yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Well, I will say to the gentleman that from my own point of view I think it is useless to appropriate this sum of \$50,000 year after year unless we make a change in the law.

Mr. LEVER. I do not agree to that proposition.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I do not imagine that the gentleman does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman informed as to how much of this appropriation is expended?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It is all expended. I think the gentleman from South Carolina can confirm that.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; it is all expended.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The reason why I object, Mr. Chairman, to this provision going in year after year without change in the law is this: The constitutionality of this law has been questioned in several jurisdictions. I understand the decisions have not been uniform respecting the question whether it is constitutional or not. But aside from that, this law in itself does not contain provisions enabling those charged with its enforcement actually to enforce it.

What do I mean by that? The control of hunting and fishing is one of the police powers of a jurisdiction or a State. The police power is one of the difficult things to enforce, because it is against the habits and the propensities of individuals in the community; that is, of certain of them, at least. It is for the public health and morals of the community that the police power resides in a State.

Now, one of the things that we are all familiar with from our childhood up is this: Some men will go out with a fishing rod and catch fish in a respectable way and come home with a reasonable number, and supply his family, and enjoy the sport, and incidentally reduce the cost of living. But aside from those there are certain ones that will go out and get all they can and sell them or throw them around and destroy them. We all know that is a fact.

In respect to game it is equally so, and perhaps more so. Ducks are migratory birds, and there are also various other kinds of migratory fowl and migratory game. There are scoundrels in the hunting business just as there are scoundrels in any other line of sport or interest.

One of the most difficult things we are called upon to deal with is the pothunter, the man who breaks the law and kills

and destroys and wastes. In my own experience I found two policemen who had gotten a week's leave and had gone up into the woods of northern Minnesota, out 50 miles from the railway, and had found a bunch of seven big moose in a swamp, and they killed those seven, and could not carry away one, and left them all there to rot. They ought to have been protectors of the law, of course, instead of its violators. That is an isolated instance, but there are many, many more of them.

The trouble with this law as it stands is this: There is no power resident in the Department of Agriculture or its agents to enforce its terms, and a man can laugh at an agent of the Department of Agriculture, and can kill all the game he wants to, and make all the breaches of the law he cares to, and is absolutely free and independent of arrest. They can not reach him at all, and they do not reach him. The only place where they do reach him is in a community which in itself has game laws and game protection, and there the violators of this law are punished, because there are agents of game administration in those communities who see to it that they are punished. The result of this is that some of the Northern States have splendid game laws and give ample protection to the game. There are some States in the middle belt that are not exactly game States, but the migratory birds coming from the north to the south and going from the south to the north pass over those States and for a time stop-over in those Central States where there are no adequate laws for the protection of game, and where the pothunters dwell, and this bill does not stop them.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. Has the gentleman read the hearings where Dr. Nelson, of the Biological Survey, tells what has been accomplished in the protection of migratory birds and game in quite a number of States, largely through the operation of this law? He gives a list of 24 States.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes. That has had a good effect. I have had the pleasure of listening to Dr. Nelson many times when he was before our committee and cooperated with him when we were drafting a law that was adopted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. PLATT. Can the gentleman tell us how soon that bill is to come before the House?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It is on the calendar now. We should be glad to call it up at any minute, but we can not do so until our committee is reached. We should be glad to incorporate it here.

Mr. PLATT. I shall be glad to vote for it whenever I get the opportunity, and I hope the Committee on Foreign Affairs may be able to secure a special rule from the Committee on Rules to bring it before the House in the near future. It is an important measure and ought not to be longer delayed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For wagons, motor trucks, bicycles, horses, harness, and maintenance of the same, \$500.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph just read. In this service are there at present any motor trucks which require maintenance? I notice in this item just read the committee have inserted as new language the words "motor trucks."

Mr. LEVER. Yes; they have one motor truck.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then this item is merely to provide for its upkeep?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment which I offered, to be inserted on page 45, after line 11, by changing the last line, so that instead of reading—

Any moneys received on account of such material shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts—

It shall read—

Any moneys received on account of such material shall be deposited in the Treasury as provided by existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to modify the amendment which he proposes, which was passed over to be called up later. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Subject to the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection to the request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This perfects the amendment and puts it in the form in which it will come up for final consideration.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Does this refer to the proceeds of the sales of timber?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Why should not such proceeds be regarded as receipts of the Forest Service?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Exactly; and the amendment as first introduced provided that the proceeds should be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. We are now perfecting it so that it shall be "as provided by existing law," which is the law covering the forest-reserve receipts. I wanted to have the amendment perfected in the Record, so that it will appear in the form in which it will be considered.

Mr. FORDNEY. The law already prescribes where the money shall go.

The CHAIRMAN. This paragraph was passed over with this amendment to be called up later, and the Chair understands the gentleman from Washington simply asks leave to modify that amendment as indicated by him. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. And the point of order is still reserved.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is still reserved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Now shall I read the paragraph as modified?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hold that when this amendment is called up the Chair will direct the Clerk to read it as the gentleman now proposes it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I thank the Chair. The amendment as now modified reads as follows:

And hereafter, during the existing state of war, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell without advertisement to any individual, firm, association, or corporation, at a fair value to be determined by him, national-forest timber which he shall find is to be used for war purposes; and he is also authorized, under regulations to be prescribed by him, to permit the War Department to take from the national forests such timber as may be needed in the prosecution of the war. The Secretary of War, under regulations to be prescribed by him, is hereby authorized to sell or otherwise dispose of any of the material manufactured from such timber which is not suitable for war purposes. Any moneys received on account of such material shall be deposited in the Treasury as provided by existing law.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase of manuscripts, traveling expenses, electrotypes, illustrations, and other expenses not otherwise provided for, \$3,000.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to have the judgment of the chairman of the committee on the general value of these various bulletins, as to whether we have published a good many that are out of date, that have no particular value, and whether we have a greater demand for certain classes, a demand so great that we are not capable of satisfying it?

Mr. LEVER. Our information is that on account of war conditions and the campaign for increased production of food, and garden work, and the like of that, the publication work of the department this year has increased enormously. We are also informed that the publications are bending themselves in the direction of furnishing information that will be valuable in this emergency. I think as a general proposition that the information work of the Department of Agriculture is exceedingly valuable.

Mr. FESS. Has the chairman of the committee any suggestion as to how to call the attention of the various farming interests to any particular bulletins? I make this inquiry in the belief that we do not secure a maximum benefit from these published findings of investigators.

Mr. LEVER. Some years ago, when I found that I had any bulletin which I supposed would be of special interest to my own constituents, I adopted the plan of having the newspapers announce that I would be glad to furnish to any of my constituents copies of the bulletin.

Mr. FESS. I think the information I have received from my own office confirms the chairman's judgment as to the bending of our energies in certain directions. If it would please the chairman, I would like to give him the results of the investigation from my own office.

Mr. LEVER. I should be very glad to have that.

Mr. FESS. Bulletins on cooking are first in the list of calls from the office, and on gardening especially the number here enumerated is second; poultry raising, with special reference to two at least, have had a tremendous demand from our particular section. Then, a general classification indicates food-stuffs first, hog raising second, cattle raising, and plant industry seems to be the order. I asked my secretary to call up the Department of Agriculture and get an estimate from that department as to this same matter. I rather think this demand from our office is about what is demanded throughout the country. I take it, for example, that that is in response to the demand produced by the war. The question especially I wanted

to raise is whether we are spending any great amount of money for bulletins that are really of no value.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think so. I try to read most of the farm bulletins as they are issued, and while some of them are of no particular interest to me because the problems discussed are of no special interest, still they are of interest to some classes of people. I do not think we are wasting money on them.

Mr. FESS. There are some bulletins that we can not supply the demand for.

Mr. LEVER. That is true.

Mr. FESS. If possible, there ought to be an increase in the number of certain bulletins that we can not now supply.

Mr. LEVER. I want to say to the gentleman that the appropriation for the supply of the bulletins is not carried in this bill. That is carried in the sundry civil bill, and they have an available appropriation of \$500,000. I recall that I moved to increase the amount in the bill by \$50,000.

Mr. FESS. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I thought we were carrying it under this item of publications.

Mr. LEVER. No; this is the item for the division which prepares the bulletins.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, library, Department of Agriculture: One librarian, \$2,000; 1 clerk, class 3; 1 clerk, class 2; 5 clerks, class 1; 3 clerks, at \$1,080 each; 3 clerks, at \$1,020 each; 4 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 6 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 clerk, \$840; 1 junior library assistant, messenger, or messenger boy, \$720; 1 junior library assistant or messenger boy, \$660; 3 junior library assistants or messenger boys, at \$600 each; 1 messenger, messenger boy, or laborer, \$480; 2 charwomen, at \$480 each; in all, \$32,160.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. While the last paragraph was being read it occurred to me that quite a large clerical force was being provided for this library. I have not counted the exact number of clerks that are herein provided, but they run up to more than 20. What is the need of having such a large clerical force in a department library? I know there are other departments that have libraries of their own which do not maintain anywhere near the clerical force provided for in this paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I will say that there is no change in this item.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am quite aware of that.

Mr. LEVER. The fact of the matter is the committee did not cross-examine the librarian, who happens to be a lady, because there was no change in this item either in the amount in the lump-sum roll or the statutory roll.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are there any clerks appropriated for out of the lump sum in addition to those on the statutory roll?

Mr. LEVER. No; there could not be unless they were temporary.

Mr. STAFFORD. Here we have 25 clerks other than the librarian, and the salaries range from \$1,600 down, most of them over \$1,000, for a mere departmental library. When the Committee on Appropriations had the question of a library for the Department of Labor, in which there were five clerks, it struck the members of the committee as being too large a force for the maintenance and operation of that department library. But here we find 25 clerks.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman knows that the Department of Agriculture has the most expensive agricultural library in the world, and probably one of the largest departmental libraries in the Government service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Take the library of the Surgeon General's office in the War Department, which is the largest medical library in the world, and yet there is no such force of clerks there.

Mr. LEVER. How many clerks are there in that force?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have not the number in mind. They have high-paid officials like translators, and the librarian receives a larger salary, but nothing near the clerical force that is provided for here. How many volumes are there in the Agricultural library?

Mr. LEVER. I can not tell offhand. We had the information once, but I can not recall it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am bringing this to the attention of the chairman, and if he has not the information now I hope next year he will make some investigation of this large clerical force, which seems to me abnormally large for a department library, and be able to give us some information.

Mr. LEVER. We had the librarian before us a year or two ago and subjected her to an examination and had full information, but I have not it here at this time.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not recall the testimony as to the necessity of this clerical force?

Mr. LEVER. No; but there has been no change in it.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, library: For books of reference, technical and scientific books, papers, and periodicals, and for expenses incurred in completing imperfect series; for the employment of additional assistants in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for official traveling expenses, and for library fixtures, library cards, supplies, and for all other necessary expenses, \$18,000.

Total for library, \$50,160.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, at the end of line 11, add the following:

"No part of any amount herein appropriated shall be used to pay salaries or for personal services in any department, bureau, or office in the District of Columbia which does not, subject to the provisions and exceptions of section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act approved March 15, 1898, require eight hours of labor each day."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that. Let me suggest to the gentleman that his amendment would come in the bill more properly later on. This is the library here, and the gentleman would inject this proposition into the very body of the bill.

Mr. BORLAND. I will say to the gentleman that I think this is an appropriate place. We have gotten down now to the point of miscellaneous expenses—stationery, blank books, and all that sort of thing. I assume it would come in here as appropriately as covering the clerical employees that preceded it, just as much so as it would anywhere else, but I have no choice as to where it comes in.

Mr. LEVER. We have yet to pass on the States Relation Service and the Bureau of Markets and a number of other things carrying statutory salaries. I think it would be better at the end of the bill. I make that suggestion to the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. I suggest to the gentleman from South Carolina that this is a particularly good time to rise. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] no doubt has some new and fresh and interesting observations to make on this important subject, and he can make them better when the committee reconvenes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment for the time being.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rent of buildings, Department of Agriculture: For rent of buildings and parts of buildings in the District of Columbia for use of the various bureaus, divisions, and offices of the Department of Agriculture, \$158,689.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 45 to take up a paragraph that went out on a point of order, in order that I may offer a substitute for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is it?

Mr. RUBEY. The paragraph in regard to the pay for traveling expenses in the Forest Service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be better to make that request at the convening of the next session. The gentleman who made the point of order is not present in the Chamber at this time.

Mr. RUBEY. I have an idea of getting the amendment in the Record, and then we could rise, and that would give opportunity to see what it is, and we could act upon it to-morrow.

Mr. MONDELL. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to return to page 45 of the bill; that he be permitted to offer an amendment to the section where lines 12 to 17 were stricken out on a point of order. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to returning to that paragraph for that purpose, but I do think this is not the hour, with this very limited attendance, to do that.

Mr. RUBEY. We will not press the amendment to-night. It is not my intention to do that.

Mr. MONDELL. If the committee rose, the matter might be presented to-morrow.

Mr. RUBEY. I just wanted to get it in the Record, so that we can proceed with it to-morrow.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think the gentleman from Wyoming understands. It is not the intention of the gentleman from Missouri to press the amendment to-night. He desires to have permission to return and have it printed in the Record as pending.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman from South Carolina expect to rise then?

Mr. LEVER. As soon as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is through, I believe he desires to ask me some questions. To protect everyone, I shall reserve the point of order on the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Missouri myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the request of the gentleman. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to return to page 45, and that he be permitted to offer an amendment and have it pending to the bill, and the gentleman from South Carolina reserves all points of order against the amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment as a separate paragraph in lieu of that stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RUBEY offers the following as a new paragraph in lieu of the one stricken out, on page 45, lines 12 to 17, inclusive: Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine after investigation that the expenses of travel can be reduced thereby he may, in lieu of actual traveling expenses, under such regulations as he may prescribe, authorize the payment of not to exceed 2 cents per mile for a motorcycle or 6 cents per mile for an automobile, used for necessary travel on official business in the Forest Service.

Mr. LEVER and Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, pending the gentleman's request, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks on the last amendment offered by me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ascertain information from the chairman as to whether the Department of Agriculture is being pressed for additional space for quarters by reason of war activities. That subject is a very live one in the Committee on Appropriations, which is considering quarters for all the departments and various Government establishments other than the Agricultural Department, and I thought it was proper at this time to obtain some general information as to the condition in the Agricultural Department.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER], has made a very full investigation of the whole matter, and I will ask him to answer the question.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am most concerned as to what additional quarters will be needed by reason of increased activities in the Department of Agriculture by reason of the war.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I will state to the gentleman that there is considerable additional space that appears to be absolutely necessary by reason of the extension of their activities growing out of the war. The Secretary himself furnished quite an extensive statement with reference to the matter.

The necessity for these additional quarters appears to be absolutely necessary. He says:

In my letter to you last January, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6, 1917, I referred briefly to the growth of the Department of Agriculture in recent years. I stated that for the fiscal year 1908 (in which year the two new laboratory buildings, known as the east and west wings, were completed and occupied) the total appropriations to the department were \$13,037,802, of which \$12,595,502 was actually disbursed. For the fiscal year 1917 the total appropriations to the department were \$36,128,852, or nearly three times the disbursements in 1908. By the food-production act (Public, No. 40, 65th Cong.) approved August 10, 1917, an additional sum of \$11,346,400 was appropriated for work devolved upon this department. Without additional clerical and supervisory employees in Washington these new lines of work can not be carried on and a place for them to work must be provided. Under great and increasing difficulties due to the demand for Government offices in Washington, we have secured a portion of the additional space needed, but we need more for the regular work of the department under the agricultural appropriation act, without regard to any additional projects which may be authorized under emergency legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman give in concrete form the additional space that will be needed by the Agricultural Department during the ensuing fiscal year for its additional work and the present work?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. If the gentleman will permit, I would suggest that I have an extensive statement here in reference to it, and I will ask that it be inserted in the Record, so that we may have the benefit of it by to-morrow morning. That will give in detail the full information which the gentleman desires.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the statement very extensive? I do not wish to burden the Record with a large number of tabulations.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. It is not very extensive.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record a statement in reference to the rents in the Agricultural Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks leave to extend his remarks in the Record, as indicated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 24, 1918.

Hon. E. S. CANDLER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CANDLER: With reference to the space rented by the Department of Agriculture in the District of Columbia and the proposed increase in the appropriation for rent in the Agricultural appropriation act, I inclose a complete statement of buildings and parts of buildings rented, showing the present situation in detail (Exhibit A). This statement shows the annual rate to be paid under the leases but does not in all cases represent the amount actually paid in this fiscal year, since some of the leases were made after the fiscal year had run for some months, as shown by the column headed "date of first lease."

Last year, in advocating an increase in the rent appropriation, I referred to the department's desire to secure in this neighborhood where it would be close to the Secretary's office, a new building which would house the Forest Service (now at 930 F Street NW.) and provide room for needed expansion of other branches. In dealing with the matter I eliminated from consideration as sites for a new rented building the three squares immediately to the south of our main building, upon which Congress may at some future time extend the Government's own buildings, and required that the building be located east of Twelfth Street SW, where it would not interfere with any known plans for Government building. The two builders who submitted plans for a new building stated that they could not secure the necessary land east of Twelfth Street at a price which would enable them to erect a building and rent it to the department at a rate per square foot which we could afford to pay. The project therefore fell through and we have been obliged to rent such buildings up town as we were able to find.

I may also state that at the time I wrote you on this subject last year (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Jan. 6, 1917) we were renting 12,410 square feet in the Munsey Building, for the Bureau of Markets, paying therefor \$14,000 per annum. At the request of the Council of National Defense we abandoned these quarters to the council on May 1, 1917, renting in lieu thereof the Busch Building at 710 E Street NW., which had just been abandoned by the Bureau of Mines. The rental of the Busch Building is \$12,000 per annum for 36,159 (gross) square feet, so that we profited by the exchange in amount of floor space occupied. By rearranging quarters in the building at 1358 B Street SW., occupied by the Bureau of Animal Industry, we were enabled to bring the Bureau of Markets offices nearer together and also to rent a small new building which had been erected at Linworth Place and B Street SW., by a Washington bank, but which was never used for bank purposes.

With the passage of the food-production act (Public No. 40, 65th Cong.), carrying \$11,346,400, new and urgent tasks were laid upon the department and more space was imperatively needed. In particular, the work of the States Relations Service and the Bureau of Markets was largely increased, making necessary a large expansion in the Washington force of these bureaus. States Relations Service administers that portion of the act which provides for increasing food production and eliminating waste and promoting conservation of food by educational and demonstrational methods through county, district, and urban agents and others, under an appropriation of \$4,348,400. This service has increased its Washington force by 135 employees. The Bureau of Markets has added nearly 1,200 employees to its Washington staff; that bureau having to conduct among other things the food surveys provided for in section 8 of the act, under an appropriation of \$2,522,000. The Bureau of Entomology has also required additional employees, the food-production act providing \$441,000 for new work in the control and eradication of insect and plant diseases injurious to agriculture.

Regardless of new lines of work authorized and directed by the food-production act, the department's needs for space remain as urgent as ever. All quarters are crowded, and we have even been driven to partitioning off the ends of corridors in the east and west wings for office rooms. The Bureau of Chemistry in particular is much in need of additional space, it having no more room now than it had four years ago. The Bureau of Crop Estimates is overcrowded, and more space is needed for its actual current work. This is true also of the Bureau of Animal Industry, States Relations Service, and the Bureau

of Markets. The estimates for additional space required, as made by the bureaus of the department, have been sharply scrutinized and freely pruned. In response to an inquiry from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I have estimated the department's probable requirements in this direction at 30,000 square feet, and this represents what we believe to be no more than actual needs. At the present uncertain and increasing prices demanded for office space in Washington it is by no means certain that the \$15,000 increase asked for in the Agricultural appropriation bill will provide the amount estimated as necessary.

By virtue of authority given in the last urgent deficiency act (Public No. 64, 65th Cong.) \$15,000 of the appropriation for miscellaneous items in the food-production act (Public No. 40, 65th Cong.) was made available for the payment of rent in the District of Columbia. By section 8 of this act (stimulating agriculture) the moneys appropriated are available only until June 30, 1918. The \$15,000 increase recommended in the appropriation for rents in the Agricultural appropriation bill will do little more than provide for quarters already under rental if the authority to pay rent from the appropriation under the food-production act is not continued. It is impossible to forecast with exactness what the situation may be with regard to the department's needs for space in the future, but it is certain that we need and shall need additional quarters.

As you are, of course, aware, the situation in Washington with regard to quarters for Government offices is extremely difficult and complicated. While this department has been reasonably successful in securing a portion of its needed additional space at rentals which are not exorbitant (see checked items in Exhibit A), the demand for space by nearly all branches of the Government in Washington has sharply limited the available space and tempted owners of property to exact or try to exact higher prices. The department is opposed, of course, to paying exorbitant rents, and in the future, as in the past, will hold to its policy of keeping rents down to the lowest possible figure, even at the risk of taking over rather undesirable quarters. As examples of this, I may cite the fact that we have rented in this neighborhood an abandoned lunch room (approximately 3,000 square feet) at \$1,000 per annum, and have under negotiation at this time the rental of an old dwelling house (about 2,800 square feet) at \$45 per month. But the available supply of such buildings is limited by the increasing demand for houses in Washington, and we can not depend upon them for future needs. I recommend, therefore, that the increase of \$15,000 in the appropriation for rents in the District of Columbia, carried in my estimates for the fiscal year 1919, be allowed in the Agricultural appropriation bill, to provide for departmental needs under that bill, without reference to any additional duties of an emergency nature which may be laid upon it by other legislation.

The highest rate per square foot paid by this department in Washington—except for one small room in the Munsey Building—is 86.4 cents per square foot. In this connection it is of interest to note the prices which the Bureau of Markets has been compelled to pay for office quarters in other cities for the Federal grain supervision work and other projects, as shown in the attached table (Exhibit B).

In my letter to you last January, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6, 1917, I referred briefly to the growth of the Department of Agriculture in recent years. I stated that for the fiscal year 1908 (in which year the two new laboratory buildings known as the east and west wings were completed and occupied) the total appropriations to the department were \$13,037,802, of which \$12,595,502 was actually disbursed. For the fiscal year 1917 the total appropriations to the department were \$36,128,852, or nearly three times the disbursements in 1908. By the food-production act (Public No. 40, 65th Cong.) approved August 10, 1917, an additional sum of \$11,346,400 was appropriated for work devolved upon this department. Without additional clerical and supervisory employees in Washington these new lines of work can not be carried on and a place for them to work must be provided. Under great and increasing difficulties, due to the demand for Government offices in Washington, we have secured a portion of the additional space needed, but we need more for the regular work of the department under the Agricultural appropriation act without regard to any additional projects which may be authorized under emergency legislation.

Very truly, yours,

D. F. HOUSTON,
Secretary.

EXHIBIT A.—Statement showing data in relation to rented buildings of the Department of Agriculture in the District of Columbia.

Name or location of building.	Character of building.	Occupied as—	Occupied by—	Floor space (square feet).		Annual rental (per square foot).	Date of first lease.	Owner or lessor.	Full assessed value; taxes paid on two-thirds of this amount.
				Net.	Gross.				
1358 B. Street SW.	Modern fireproof 8-story and basement office building.	Offices and laboratories.	Bureau Markets... 40,948 Library... 11,881 Biological Survey... 8,298 Publications... 7,716 Plant Industry... 6,946 Crop Estimates... 1,255	76,128	88,955	\$35,360 \$0.404 \$0.397	Dec. 3, 1914	Mrs. H. M. Halliday, owner; F. H. Smith Co., agents, 815 15th St. NW.	\$280,769
220 14th St. SW.	Modern fireproof 6-story and basement office building.	Offices and storage.	States Relations Service... 25,887 Plant Industry... 21,939	47,826	55,603	20,000 .418 .36	Aug. 28, 1912	Western Investment Co., owners; F. H. Smith Co., agents, 815 15th St. NW.	183,294
930 F St. NW. (Atlantic Building).	Old brick office building, 8-story and basement.	do.	Forest Service.....	34,171	45,310	18,000 .526 .397	July 1, 1901	Atlantic Building Co., M. M. Parker, pres., 1418 F St. NW.	208,005
601 13th St. NW. (Homer Building). Portion of second and third floors.	Modern fireproof office building.	Offices.....	Bureau of Markets 10,290 Plant Industry... 9,529	19,819	19,819	17,000 .857 .857	July 1, 1917	Washington New Theater Co., owners; F. H. Smith Co., agents, 815 15th St. NW.	1,303,653
215 13th St. SW. (Chemistry Building).	6-story and basement fireproof laboratory building.	Offices and laboratories.	Bureau of Chemistry....	49,810	56,154	16,000 .321 .284	Mar. 8, 1909	Peter J. Campbell and Wm. T. Shea, 632 Pa. Ave. NW.	146,792

EXHIBIT A.—Statement showing data in relation to rented buildings of the Department of Agriculture in the District of Columbia—Continued.

Name or location of building.	Character of building.	Occupied as—	Occupied by—	Floor space (square feet).		Annual rental	Annual rental (per square foot).		Date of first lease.	Owner or lessor.	Full assessed value; taxes paid on two-thirds of this amount.
				Net.	Gross.		Net.	Gross.			
710 E St. NW. (Busch Building).	6-story and basement, brick office building.	Offices and storage.	Animal Industry. 29,191 (Bureau of Soils.. 448)	29,639	36,149	\$12,000	\$0.404	\$0.331	May 1, 1917	Anheuser-Busch Brewing Association; J. L. Heiskell, agent, 1403 H St. NW.	\$124,515
513-515 14th St. NW. (Willard Building).	Modern 8-story office building.	Offices and laboratories.	Public Roads and Rural Engineering.	27,775	33,851	9,500	.342	.281	Apr. 12, 1915	National Savings & Trust Co., 15th and N. Y. Ave., and H. K. Willard, trustees.	126,653
339-341 Pennsylvania Ave. NW. (Globe Building).	Old 4-story brick building, warehouse construction.	Congressional seed distribution.	Plant Industry.....	34,832	39,279	4,800	.137	.122	Sept. 1, 1912	R. W. Shoppell, owner, Warder Building.	40,969
215 13th St. SW....	4-story, basement, brick building, built for warehouse purposes.	Offices, storage, and mailing.	Publications.....	15,674	18,258	4,000	.255	.218	Mar. 1, 1905	Norton M. Little, agent, 1413 H St. NW.	31,930
1316 B St. SW.....	Modern 3-story brick building.	Offices, files, and storage.	Office of Solicitor.....	8,554	9,792	3,000	.35	.306	May 1, 1904	John M. Beavers, owner, H and Water Sts. SW.	27,006
220 13th St. SW....	3-story brick warehouse, remodeled.	Offices and laboratories.	Insecticide and Fungicide Board..... 7,424 Chemistry..... 1,000 Plant Industry..... 5,187 States Relations Service..... 4,955	8,424	9,843	3,000	.355	.304	Apr. 14, 1913	Frank J. Hogan, owner, Evans Building.	25,567
200-202 14th St. SW.	4-story and basement brick building, remodeled and fireproof.	Offices, laboratories, and storage.	Federal Horticultural Board..... 984 Biological Survey..... 677 Forest Applications..... 545	13,348	14,077	3,000	.243	.213	July 1, 1900	R. Harrison Johnson, 307 7th St. SW.	32,153
Linworth and B Sts. SW. (Harper Building).	3-story brick office building.	Offices.....	Animal Industry.....	5,662	6,405	2,700	.476	.421	May 1, 1917	Robert N. Harper, owner, District National Bank Building.	29,580
1304-06 B St. SW...	3-story and basement, double brick structure.	Offices and storage.	Plant Industry.....	11,216	13,010	2,500	.222	.192	Sept. 1, 1901	Tyler & Rutherford, agents, 817 15th St. NW.	32,501
224 12th St. SW....	3-story brick, double building.	do.....	Farm Management.....	9,164	11,894	2,500	.272	.21	Dec. 22, 1902	American Security & Trust Co., agents, 15th St. and Pa. Ave. NW.	25,613
215 12th St. SW....	Old 3-story brick residence.	Offices.....	do.....	2,129	2,810	450	.211	.16	Apr. 8, 1914	A. G. Belt, agent, 1309 G St. NW.	5,468
217 12th St. SW....	do.....	do.....	Farm Management. 1,249 Exhibits..... 806	2,055	2,596	450	.218	.173	Aug. 1, 1914	do.....	7,075
Munsey Building (room 638).	Modern granite, fireproof office building.	Offices Meat Inspection.	Animal Industry (field service).	366	366	420	1.15	1.15	July 1, 1917	Munsey Building Co., Munsey Building.	1,806,519
221 Linworth Place SW.	Modern brick and concrete, fireproof, 5-story and basement storage building.	Cotton storage and paper work.	Bureau Markets.. 19,623 Animal Industry.. 853	20,476	22,067	5,400	.263	.245	June 1, 1906	Columbia Properties Co., Woodward Building.	46,931
220 Linworth Place SW.	New fireproof storage warehouse.	Storage of cotton and supplies.	Bureau Markets.. 10,271 Animal Industry.. 4,521 Secretary's office. 208	15,000	15,820	3,750	.25	.237	Nov. 1, 1916	Boyle-Robertson Construction Co., Evans Building.	28,765
E St. SW. between 11th and 12th Sts. (Terminal storage warehouse.)	Modern fireproof storage warehouse.	Storage of cotton and paper.	Bureau Markets.....	4,519	4,519	1,200	.265	.265	July 23, 1917	Washington Market Co. (Inc.), 7th and Pennsylvania Ave. NW.	271,570.50
1315 C St. NW.....	2-story brick warehouse.	Storage of cotton.	do.....	3,680	3,680	1,000	.271	.271	Dec. 20, 1915	W. D. Sullivan, 817 15th St. NW.	6,564
212-214 13th St. SW	Old 3-story brick residences.	Supply rooms and storage.	Bureau Chemistry.....	7,784	9,002	960	.123	.106	Dec. 1, 1894	Peter J. Campbell and Wm. T. Shea, 632 Pennsylvania Ave. NW.	13,138
215 12th St. SW. (rear).	2-story brick garage building.	Storage.....	Bureau Chemistry. 1,395 Biological Survey. 589 Bureau Markets.. 512 Bureau Soils..... 514 Public Roads..... 2,088 Animal Industry.. 779	2,496	2,906	600	.24	.206	Aug. 1, 1915	Chas. A. Langley, 310 12th St. NW.	5,103
929 7th St. SW.....	Old warehouse.....	do.....	do.....	8,051	8,553	600	.074	.07	June 1, 1913	George E. Walker, owner, 501 7th St. SW.	16,393
2511 M St. NW.....	New storage building.	do.....	Weather Bureau.....	2,332	2,332	500	.214	.214	Aug. 20, 1917	J. J. Leary, 1203 26th St. NW.	(1)
920 F St. NW. (portion of basement).	Office building.....	do.....	Forest Service.....	930	930	420	.451	.451	July 1, 1917	Ben Schwartz, 920 F St. NW.	93,768
913 E St. NW (rear)	1-story shop building.	Workshop.....	do.....	1,474	1,474	270	.185	.185	Nov. 1, 1902	Jeremiah O'Connor, owner, T. D. Walsh, agent, 1312 F St. NW.	4,200
1228 C St. SW (rear)	Old 1-story and loft stable.	Storage.....	Public Roads.....	1,200	1,200	144	.12	.12	Aug. 1, 1907	C. D. Harvey, 1228 C St. SW.	600
215 Linworth Place SW. (rear).	1-story building of frame construction.	do.....	Animal Industry (meat inspection).	295	295	120	.401	.401	Aug. 1, 1915	Mrs. M. E. Winfield, owner, 333 11th St. SW.	500
349 Pennsylvania Ave. NW. (rear).	Garage.....	Automobile truck storage.	Plant Industry.....	233	233	84	.36	.36	Oct. 18, 1916	Robt. J. Michael, 349 Pennsylvania Ave. NW.	500
1312 B St. SW.....	2-story brick, with frame addition.	Offices.....	States Relations Service.	3,000	3,000	1,000	.333	.333	Nov. 16, 1917	Rufus J. Boyd, 1319 G St. NW.	8,514
Bank of Commerce & Savings (7th and E Sts. NW.).	Modern fireproof 4-story office building.	do.....	Bureau of Markets.....	6,800	6,800	5,200	.764	.764	Nov. 1, 1917	Bank of Commerce & Savings, 7th and E Sts. NW.	184,320

*Not assessed.

EXHIBIT A.—Statement showing data in relation to rented buildings of the Department of Agriculture in the District of Columbia—Continued.

Name or location of building.	Character of building.	Occupied as—	Occupied by—	Floor space (square feet).		Annual rental.	Annual rental (per square foot).		Date of first lease.	Owner or lessor.	Full assessed value; taxes paid on two-thirds of this amount.
				Net.	Gross.		Net.	Gross.			
Legal Building (8th and G Sts. N.W.).	4-story and basement office building.	Offices	Bureau of markets	8,100	8,100	\$7,000	\$0.864	\$0.864	Jan. 1, 1918	E. K. Fox, 1311 H St. N.W.	\$53,928
1120 Virginia Ave. S.W.	Old 3-story brick residence.do.....	Bureau of Entomology..	2,800	2,800	540	.192	.192	Feb. 1, 1918	Wm. P. Normoyle, agent, 810 F. St. N.W.	5,607
				485,772	557,882	183,468	.3776	.3288			

The total rent (\$183,468) is paid by—

Appropriation "Rent in the district of Columbia"..... \$143,689
 Other appropriations (meat inspection; warehouse act; determining cotton standards and spot markets; grain standards; cotton-futures act; stimulating agriculture and distribution of agricultural products)..... 39,779
 All these appropriations carry specific authority to pay rent in the District of Columbia.

EXHIBIT B.—Statement showing rentals paid by the Bureau of Markets in various cities for branch office space.

City.	Project.	Building.	Area in square feet.	Annual rental.	Rate per square foot.
Jacksonville, Fla....	Market news service on fruits and vegetables.	Bisbee	514	\$480.00	\$0.95
Omaha, Nebr.	do.....	Farnam	594	540.00	.90
Baltimore, Md.	Grain supervision...	Garrett	1,519	2,094.20	1.37
Boston, Mass.	do.....	Oliver	630	1,400.00	2.22
Do.....	Market news service on live stock and meats.	Fidelity Trust.	852	1,600.00	1.87
Chicago, Ill.	Grain and hay market reporting service.	Board of Trade.	975	1,200.00	1.23
Detroit, Mich.	Grain supervision...	Holden	380	780.00	2.02
Memphis, Tenn.	do.....	Exchange	523	780.00	1.48
New York City	Grain and hay market reporting service.	Lord's Court	630	1,250.00	1.98
Philadelphia, Pa.	Grain supervision...	Bourse	1,165	1,800.00	1.11
San Francisco, Cal.	Grain and hay market reporting service.	Merchants Exchange.	503	780.00	1.53

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,
 Washington, January 24, 1918.

Hon. E. S. CANDLER,
 House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CANDLER: The inclosed memorandum from the chief clerk may be of interest to you in connection with the Secretary's letter regarding the rental of buildings for the Department of Agriculture. You will note that we now pay \$18,000 a year for the building occupied by the Forest Service, and that the lessors of the building have notified the department that if the Forest Service desires to remain in their present quarters it will have to be at an annual rental of \$34,000.

Very truly, yours,

F. R. HARRISON,
 Assistant to the Secretary.

MEMORANDUM WITH REGARD TO THE QUARTERS OCCUPIED BY THE FOREST SERVICE, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, IN THE ATLANTIC BUILDING, 390 F STREET NW.

With the exception of two stores and a barber shop on the first floor, the Forest Service occupies the whole of this building. The department's option of renewal on the lease expires with June 30, 1918, the end of the current fiscal year. Since July 1, 1915, the department has paid for these quarters \$18,000 a year. The building is of the type known as "slow burning," not of modern construction, and its usefulness to the Forest Service has lately been reduced by the erection of a theater which closes several windows on the western side. The net available floor space in the building used by the Forest Service is 34,171 square feet, excluding halls.

The lessors of the building (the Atlantic Building Co.) have informed the department, in a letter dated December 28, 1917, that if the Forest Service "desires to remain in their present quarters, it will have to be at an annual rental of \$34,000." This is an increase of \$16,000, or 89 per cent over the rental now paid. With the present demand for quarters to house the offices of the Government in Washington, it will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to find other quarters for the Forest Service, even at a much higher rental than the present rate of \$18,000 per annum. This is cited to illustrate the difficulties the department experiences in attempting to provide office space for its bureaus.

R. M. REESE, Chief Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:
 States Relations Service.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the

Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 9054, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. PAIGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. TALBOTT, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness.

"GARABED" PATENT.

Mr. CROSSER, from the Committee on Patents, submitted the conference report on House joint resolution 174, "for the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources of the United States, for lessening the expenses of the war, and restoring the losses caused by the war, by providing for the employment of a discovery or invention called 'Garabed,' claiming to make possible the utilization of free energy," for printing under the rules.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 30, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting revised draft of a proposed bill to regulate the pay of retired chief warrant officers and warrant officers on active duty (H. Doc. No. 871) was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (S. 3387) to authorize and empower the President to create military zones around shipyards where vessels are under construction for the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 272), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (S. 2469) to authorize the change of name of the steamship *Caldera* to *A. T. Kinney*, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 273), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 9352) to amend an act entitled "An act providing for an Assistant Secretary of War," approved March 5, 1890, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9353) to amend the Army appropriation bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 9354) to amend the practice and procedure in Federal courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOSTER: Resolution (H. Res. 238) to pay to Adah B. Sauer, widow of Charles L. Sauer, late messenger on the soldiers' roll of the House, a sum equal to six months' salary; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 9355) granting an increase of pension to Harvey M. D. Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 9356) granting an increase of pension to Jason L. Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 9357) for the relief of John A. Gauley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 9358) granting a pension to Elmer Wagar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9359) granting a pension to John Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9360) granting a pension to George W. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 9361) granting a pension to Herbert L. Ellsworth; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 9362) granting an increase of pension to Robert T. Ridings; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 9363) granting a pension to Robert McCarty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 9364) granting an increase of pension to John J. Bruner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9365) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Spele; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9366) granting an increase of pension to Henry Burcham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 9367) granting an increase of pension to David N. Landers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9368) granting an increase of pension to John J. Byrne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9369) granting a pension to Charles M. Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9370) granting a pension to Joseph P. West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9371) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Blair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9372) granting a pension to Daniel D. Brothers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9373) granting an increase of pension to Freeman W. Waitt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9374) granting a pension to Thomas Dunn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9375) granting a pension to Benjamin Laurence; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9376) granting a pension to Bartholomew F. O'Connor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 9377) granting a pension to William J. Lawless; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 9378) granting an increase of pension to T. J. Rowlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9379) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Helles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 9380) granting an increase of pension to William G. Files; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9381) granting an increase of pension to John Beattie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 9382) granting an increase of pension to Dennis H. Hunt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGUE: A bill (H. R. 9383) for the relief of Maud M. Sterling; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9384) for the relief of Rena Sterling; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9385) for the relief of Agnes M. Dempsey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 9386) granting a pension to Agnes O'Brien; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 9387) granting a pension to Minnie K. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petitions of druggists of Leavenworth and Marshall Counties, Kans., transmitted by Harry Dick, of Lawrence, Kans., in support of House bill 5531; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: Memorial of Elmhurst Men's Christian and Civic League of New York City, favoring war emergency prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Froebel League of New York, favoring maintenance of the kindergarten division in the Bureau of Education; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Central Labor Union of Brooklyn and Queens, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 7356 relative to increase in pay of Government employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of George W. Sturtevant, consulting engineer, Paradise-Verde project, favoring passage of Senate bill 758 relative to financing, etc., of irrigation and drainage projects; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Froebel League of New York, favoring appropriation for maintenance of the Kindergarten Division in Bureau of Education; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Central Labor Union of Brooklyn and Queens, favoring passage of House bill 7356, for increase in pay of Federal civil employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolutions of the College Hall Library Club, Sherman, Tex., and of the Tyrone (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, urging the repeal of that part of the war-revenue act dealing with second-class postal rates; also, a letter from Hogan & Son, New York City, protesting against such repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENISON: Petition of James A. Mitchell, Butler, Ill., praying for increased rate of pay for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of rural letter carriers at Dongola, Ill., praying for increase in salaries of rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Harold L. Reese, Jonesboro, Ill., praying for increased rate of pay for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Charles E. Foster, of Cache, Ill., praying for increased rate of pay for rural letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Harvey D. Tinsley, of Mulkeytown, Ill., praying for increased rate of pay for rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Mr. Amos C. Harvey, of Thompsonville, Ill., praying for increased rate of pay for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Henry R. Hatfield, of Ava, Ill., praying for increase of rural carrier salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John M. Stanfield, of Christopher, Ill., praying for increase in salaries of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Warren J. Melliore, of Prairie du Rocher, Ill., praying for increase of salaries for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Thomas H. Reid, H. T. Marshall, Joseph Weir, and H. S. Heitmann, praying for an increase of salary for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of F. P. Anderson, of Pinckneyville, Ill., praying for increase of salaries for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of C. E. Malan, of Pinckneyville, Ill., praying for increase of salaries of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Louis P. Ahlers, of Pinckneyville, Ill., praying for increase of salaries of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of William Owens, of Pinckneyville, Ill., praying for increase in salary of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Samuel A. Leemon, of Sparta, Ill., praying for increase in rate of pay for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Charles L. Hileman, of Anna, Ill., praying for increased rate of pay for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Harley R. Blick, of Anna, Ill., praying for an increase of salaries for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Louis M. Boren, of Alto Pass, Ill., praying for increase of salary for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Samuel Griggs, of Creal Springs, Ill., praying for increase of salary for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Harry Payne, of Benton, Ill., praying for increase of salary of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Ernest B. Hampton, of Benton, Ill., praying for increase in salary for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of C. T. Eddleman, of Dongola, Ill., praying for increase of salary for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Jodie Bell, of Pulaski, Ill., praying for increase in salary of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Edgar D. Gordon, of Ava, Ill., praying for an increase of pay for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Frank Gandy, Ullin, Ill., praying for increase in salary of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of George W. Creed, Benton, Ill., praying for increase of salary of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Samuel G. Williamson, Ava, Ill., praying for increase of salary of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Oliver I. Underwood, Carbondale, Ill., praying for increase of salary for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Charles N. Grey, praying for increase of salary for rural mail carriers for Pinckneyville, Ill.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Ernest Brooks, Cobden, Ill., praying for increase in salary of rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Memorial of the Tyrone (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, for the repeal of the second-class postal provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of rural-mail carriers of the twelfth district of Illinois, for increased compensation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of Norris C. Stroud, Philadelphia, Pa., urging legislation to develop the water-power resources of the country; to the Special Committee on Water Power.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Resolutions adopted by Meridian Grange, No. 265, Kent, Wash., urging that the sale of Government securities at prices below par be made a treasonable offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Evidence in support of House bill 8228, granting increased pension to Henry Loveland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 8523, granting increased pension to Thomas F. Regan, alias George C. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany House bill 9341, for the relief of Jesse C. Eldridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN: Three hundred citizens of the fifteenth ward of Pittsburgh, Pa., believing that war prohibition would be the means of conserving large quantities of foodstuffs, urge the immediate enactment of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of war council of the Providence Chamber of Commerce, urging passage of the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Union Label Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, on revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of N. E. Power Co., Worcester, Mass., on universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Trade Association of South Boston Business Men, on present coal situation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Dorchester Retail Merchants' Committee, Dorchester Board of Trade, Boston, Mass., on present coal situation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Colgate & Co., on daylight saving; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTON: Resolutions adopted by the citizens of Roswell, N. Mex., protesting against the creation of a war council; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 30, 1918.

Rev. Hugh T. Stevenson, of the city of Washington, delivered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, Thou in whom we live, move, and have our being, as a Nation and as individuals we turn to thank Thee, O Thou God of Washington, Lincoln, McKinley, and our fathers, that in every hour of our Nation's crisis Thou hast heard and answered the prayers of our people and hath led us in time of storm and stress to success. Once more we come to Thee as the shadow of death hath entered the ranks of the membership of the Senate and ask Thee in the name of our risen Lord to give unto the membership of this Senate of the presence of the Holy Spirit that they may be comforted in their personal loss; and what we ask for them we beseech Thee to grant especially to the members of the bereaved family, the wife and children and those who looked to the Senator from New Jersey as a guide in the affairs of life. We beseech Thee not only to remember them, but we ask Thee to be with the homes where to-day throughout the Nation there are anxious thoughts and anxious hearts. Sustain and strengthen them. Help them by Thy presence that they may rejoice that one of their own has been offered upon the altar of freedom for Thy glory; and be with those who are called to go down into the valley of the shadow of death.

We ask Thee to be with the men of our Army and of our Navy where they are on land or on the infested sea or in the air. Watch over, sustain, and strengthen them. Grant that in the hour of battle they may be conscious of Thy presence. Be with them in the hour of struggle in France and in the camp where they may be in this land, as representatives of Thee and of the Nation, that they may have that righteousness and that spirit which exalteth a people.

We ask especially that Thy spirit may be granted unto every Government employee, to the courts, to Members of the House, the Senate, the Cabinet, and the President of our country, that under the leadership of Thy Holy Spirit we may be guided in this hour as a Nation to glorify and honor Thee. To this end help us as a people to lay aside every weight and the sin that doth so easily beset us. May a spirit of unselfishness enter into the service for humanity that the principles of democracy and of liberty and of international justice may be preserved, and, finally, based upon the eternal truths of Thy revealed word, that there may come a permanent and perpetual peace. To this end grant that Thy direction shall be given unto the Senate in this hour and to our Nation throughout all coming days. In the name and to the glory of our risen Lord we ask it. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Monday last, when, on request of Mr. JAMES and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9160) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 195) providing for the sale of the coal and asphalt deposits in the segregated mineral land in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, Okla., and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

MILITARY SERVICE OF ALIENS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following letter from the Secretary of State, which will be read.